

# The Review of English Studies

VOL. XX.—No. 79.

JULY, 1944

## THE LAW AND DEFAMATORY BIOGRAPHIES IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY<sup>1</sup>

By HUGH MACDONALD

In the year 1641 two famous books, Cavendish's *Life of Wolsey* and Naunton's *Fragmenta Regalia*, which had remained in manuscript for many years after their authors had died, were printed for the first time. In the same year two other books, Sir Thomas More's *Richard III* and *Leycester's Commonwealth*, were reprinted after long periods, during which they had probably been little read. The appearance of all four at this time was designed to serve an immediate political end, and was made possible by the suppression of the Court of Star Chamber. I shall return to these books later and then describe a number of defamatory lives written as a result of political and religious controversy during the last part of the seventeenth century. Many of the books I shall mention belong rather to journalism than to what is generally called literature. But they probably had considerable influence on the development of more impartial biography, and some are of interest because they form a link between the romance (whether English or translated from the French or Spanish) and the realistic fiction of Defoe. I can select only a limited number of 'lives' as they were very numerous between 1660-1700. It was a period when personal and political animosities were strong, and it is difficult to account for the character of a good deal of the writing in the years which followed the Restoration unless it is remembered that the fear of another civil war was, at times, very real. Nobody now, I suppose, would write, as Dr. McKerrow did in *Shakespeare's England* (1917), that as far as he was

<sup>1</sup> The word 'libel' only gradually attained its present meaning. It originally meant 'a little book' (libellus). By the seventeenth century it generally meant defamatory writing of some sort.

aware there was 'not a single instance of a work of literary importance having been lost to us through the refusal to license it'.<sup>1</sup> The law of seditious libel was probably a more severe restriction on writers than the licensing laws. It is difficult to assess 'literary importance', but it has long been known how careful dramatists had to be during Elizabeth's reign and the early years of James I's reign if they wished to avoid serious trouble. It was a dangerous matter to write anything which reflected, or might be interpreted as reflecting, on the Sovereign or on persons connected with the Government or the Church; and even quite humble people could invoke the aid of the criminal law if the Crown lawyers were willing to act.<sup>2</sup> In theory at least, the law remained unchanged: Lord Chief Justice Jeffreys pointed out in 1680 that it was an offence to libel public *and private* persons; and for what it was worth, a provision to this effect had been included in the Licensing Act of 1662. On the other hand, the extensive immunity which writers enjoyed from actions for libel in the Civil Courts made it easy for very derogatory opinions to be expressed and malicious lives to be written about people whom the government did not wish to protect.

There were two main types of defamatory biography. One was a direct attack by the narration of untrue or malicious stories: the other was a biography of a historical character written with the obvious intention of suggesting an unpleasant parallel to the life of a living person (or one recently dead) whom the author wished to traduce. Either might be refused a license, or, if licensed, the book might still get the writer into trouble for publishing a seditious libel.<sup>3</sup>

I will try to state in outline the law of seditious and civil libel as it was administered in the seventeenth century. Neither the law of criminal nor of civil libel had an inherent relation to the licensing laws; but as they were connected in practice it will be necessary to mention some of the Orders, Ordinances and Statutes controlling the Press from 1538 till the final abolition of any form of licensing in 1695.

The principles applied by the Court of Star Chamber to seditious

<sup>1</sup> Vol. ii, p. 221. He somewhat modified this in the next sentence; but Dr. Greg's remark in *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company* (1930), p. lxi, that 'it is never safe to forget that [Elizabethan literature] was in some important respects a controlled output' is a more accurate way of stating the position.

<sup>2</sup> The imprisonment of Jonson, Chapman, and Marston for writing *Eastward Hoe* is a well known event. Professor Sisson has added to our knowledge of the troubles of the dramatists in his *Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age* (1936). His account of Star Chamber proceedings in the case of less distinguished persons is invaluable; but it must be borne in mind that he is citing proceedings for seditious (or criminal) libel and not for civil libel, though in this Court the distinction may not have been quite clearly defined.

<sup>3</sup> 'Seditious libel' cannot be easily defined. It was criminal for the reason given below, and because it tended to create a breach of the peace. A number of judgments from early times till well into the nineteenth century are quoted in J. Patterson's *The Liberty of the Press*, etc. (1880).

writings had become embodied in the Common Law.<sup>1</sup> The view was generally held that 'the ruler must be regarded as being the superior of the subject as being by nature wise and good, so that it must naturally follow that it was wrong to censure him'.<sup>2</sup> Till the eighteenth century and even later it was held to be necessary for all governments that the people should have a good opinion of them.<sup>3</sup> A Resolution by the judges that it was an offence at Common Law to print or sell books scandalous to the Government or tending to sedition was passed in 1663,<sup>4</sup> and their opinion was given to the same effect, and published in *The London Gazette* for 6 May 1680, when the Licensing Act had been temporarily allowed to lapse. As it was perilous to publish strictures on the Government, it was of course equally dangerous to write unfavourable biographies of people in authority.<sup>5</sup> It must be remembered, too, that although the Courts of Common Law worked with a jury, which the Star Chamber did not, all the jury had to do was to find the fact of publication. The question of whether or not a book was seditious was one for the judges.<sup>6</sup> This, at any rate until the Revolution of 1688, gave the executive considerable indirect power, although it would be wrong to suppose that the judges were merely the instruments of the Crown. The law in theory was the same whether the Licensing Act was in existence or not. In practice, as we shall see, it made a considerable difference.

Before saying anything about libel as a civil wrong, or tort, it will be as well to remind the reader of some of the provisions made for the licensing of publications.<sup>7</sup> The early provisions relating to the book-trade were

<sup>1</sup> In *De libellis famosis* (1606) Coke declared that the Star Chamber and the Common Law Courts had a concurrent jurisdiction, and that an indictment for defamation could be presented at Common Law. With the fall of Star Chamber in 1640 the whole of its jurisdiction in defamation was absorbed in Common Law. See H. Potter, *An Historical Introduction to English Law* (1932), p. 362.

<sup>2</sup> See Sir W. Holdsworth, *History of English Law*, vol. viii, pp. 337 et. seq.

<sup>3</sup> *R. v. Tutchin* (1704), *State Trials*, XIV (1812). Tutchin was prosecuted for publishing libellous matter in *The Observer*.

<sup>4</sup> Holdsworth, *op. cit.*, vol. viii, p. 340. See also trials of Twyn and other booksellers and printers, where the law was explained by Hyde L.C.J., *State Trials*, vol. vi (1810).

<sup>5</sup> The writers and publishers of blasphemous and obscene books were also indictable.

<sup>6</sup> In the trial of the Seven Bishops in 1688, *S.T.*, vol. xii (1812), the question of whether they were guilty or not guilty of publishing a seditious libel was left to the jury without a clear direction. Two of the judges were of opinion that the bishops' petition to the King constituted a seditious libel and two were of opinion that it did not. The jury was given power to return a general verdict by Fox's Libel Act (1792).

<sup>7</sup> So far as I am aware there is no book dealing with the licensing laws for all the years they were in force. Information will be found in the following books and articles: Macaulay's *History*, 1860-1 edition; Arber's *Transcripts of the Stationers' Register 1554-1640* (1875-7); A. Birrell's *Seven Lectures on Copyright* (1899); J. W. Hales's and Arber's editions of *Aeropagitica*; E. G. Duff's *Century of the English Book Trade 1457-1557* (1905); H. R. Plomer's and R. B. McKerrow's *Dictionaries of Printers* (1907-10); G. Kitchen's *Sir Roger L'Estrange* (1913); *Shakespeare's England* (1917); A. W. Pollard's *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates* (1917, 1920); and 'Some Notes on the History of Copyright, 1662-1774', *The Library* (1922); W. M. Clyde's 'Parliament and the Press 1643-7', *The Library* (1933); G. B. Harrison's 'Books and Readers, 1599-1603', *The Library* (1933). See also R. B. McKerrow's *Introduction to Bibliography* (1927).

chiefly concerned with aliens and the entry into this country of books from overseas. The first Proclamation requiring books to be licensed was issued in the year 1538.<sup>1</sup> The incorporation of the Stationers' Company, now regarded as a piece of Tudor statesmanship analogous to government through a Trade Union, followed in 1557. Elizabeth issued her Injunctions in 1559, which brought licensing largely under the control of the bishops. Decrees of the Star Chamber, including one under Whitgift in June 1586, were issued from time to time, the most elaborate provisions being set out in that of 11 July 1637. This decree contained thirty-three clauses, and dealt with a number of matters ranging from the importation of books from abroad to the recognition of the agreement between Sir Thomas Bodley and the Company whereby the Bodleian received copies of books from the Company. The most important clauses were No. 1, which prohibited the publication of seditious books,<sup>2</sup> Nos. 2 and 3, which required all books to be licensed by the holders of certain specified offices, and No. 25 which gave the right of search 'for the better discovery of printing in corners' to the Master and Warden of the Company and two Master-Printers to be appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, who were constituted the licensing authorities for all books except those in special classes such as law and books of history 'belonging to this state and present times'. The latter were to be licensed by a Secretary of State.

From November 1640 when the Long Parliament met, the Court of Star Chamber, in many ways a valuable institution,<sup>3</sup> ceased to have power over the Press, which it had for long tyrannized, although the Court was not legally abolished till the King could be induced to assent to the necessary bill on 5 July 1641.<sup>4</sup> An Order of the Commons was made 29 January 1642

p. 140; Greg and Boswell's *Records of the Stationers' Company, 1576-1602* (1930); H. G. Aldis 'The Book Trade 1557-1625'; J. B. Williams 'The Beginning of English Journalism', *C.H.E.L.*, vols. iv, vii. The following may usefully be consulted: Dunton's *Life and Errors* (1704, 1818); Edmund Bohun's *Diary and Autobiography* (1853); Holdsworth's *History of English Law*; J. B. Williams' *History of Journalism in the Seventeenth Century* (1908); H. G. Pollard's 'Book Production and Distribution', *C.B.E.L.*

<sup>1</sup> Holdsworth, vol. iv, p. 305. The Proclamation prohibited the importation of English books printed abroad, and the printing of any English book, unless the contents had been previously examined by the Privy Council, or by some person appointed by it. Books of Scripture were prohibited till they had been examined either by the king, a privy councillor or a bishop. The ultimate control of printing lay with the Court of High Commission; see *Records of the Stationers' Company* (1930), p. xli. The fact that books could be legally printed only in London, and, for a time, at York—apart from the authorized printers for the Universities at Oxford and Cambridge—was a great help to the Government in controlling the Press.

<sup>2</sup> The clause includes books written to the scandal of 'any corporation or particular person or persons whatsoever'.

<sup>3</sup> 'There can, I think, be no doubt that under Elizabeth and James this Court was regarded as perfectly legal—though there may have been doubts as to how it came to be legal.' F. W. Maitland, *The Constitutional History of England* (1908), p. 262.

<sup>4</sup> *Cal. S. P. Dom.*, 1641-3, p. 44. The Court of High Commission was abolished at the same time.

that nothing was to be printed without the name and consent of the author, and an Order of 9 March 1643 gave powers of search to the Committee of Examinations. But during this time the Press was under little control because of the general confusion—a confusion which occurred again at the time of the Popish Plot, and led to a somewhat similar loss of power by the Government over the publishing trade. Writers and stationers had in fact a great measure of freedom until 14 June 1643, when an Ordinance of Parliament was made, which though less elaborate than the Star Chamber decree of 1637, directed that no book, etc., should be printed unless 'the same be first approved of and licensed under the hands of such person or persons as both or either of the said houses shall appoint . . . and entered in the Register Book of the Company of Stationers according to ancient custom'.<sup>1</sup> 'The Master and Wardens of the said Company, the Gentleman Usher of the Peers, the Serjeant of the Commons House . . . together with the persons formerly appointed by the Committee of the House of Commons', were authorized to search for unlicensed books, to remove presses and so on. Justices of the Peace were required to assist them. The object of this Ordinance was the same as that of the Star Chamber Decree, but the Government was a different one, and consequently had different views of what books were undesirable. Books of Divinity were to be licensed by a body of twelve divines; miscellaneous literature, including poetry and history, was to be licensed by three specified persons. The Licensers were Puritans instead of Bishops. 'New presbyter is but old priest writ large.' The Ordinance is famous because it called forth Milton's *Areopagitica*.<sup>2</sup> His *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*<sup>3</sup> was cited by the Stationers' Company as an example of an illegal publication in a Petition to the Commons of 24 August 1644. But although Milton's views on divorce could not have been to the taste of any religious body, the Committee of Printing did not take any very active steps, notwithstanding that Milton and his publisher ignored the Ordinance, so far as the divorce pamphlet and *Areopagitica* were concerned.<sup>4</sup> Another Ordinance was issued on 30 September 1647, forbidding the publication of unlicensed books and pamphlets. Henry Walker was given the task of searching for unlicensed printing. He is reported to have baited 'his mouse trap at every corner of the City to catch ballads and pamphlets'; but the Ordinances do not seem to have been effective. The Press teemed with books and pamphlets. *Eikon Basilike: The Portraiture of*

<sup>1</sup> *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660*, edited by C. H. Firth and R. S. Rait (1911).

<sup>2</sup> The Thomason copy, 'Ex dono Authoris', is dated 24 November 1644. For a petition to Parliament to allow liberty to the Press in January 1649, see J. B. Williams, *A History of English Journalism*, pp. 62-3.

<sup>3</sup> The Thomason copy is dated 1 August 1643.

<sup>4</sup> Masson's *Life of Milton*, vol. iii, pp. 273-4.

his *Sacred Majesty in his Solitude and Sufferings* (1648), which Parliament could not have welcomed, went into at least forty-seven editions. On 20 September 1649 the Government procured the passing of the most drastic Act since the Star Chamber decree of 1637.<sup>1</sup> The act of 1649 expired in 1651, and for a time there was more liberty. In January 1653 a new act was passed. The Long Parliament was expelled by Cromwell on 20 April 1653, and there was again more liberty.<sup>2</sup> During the rule of the Puritans attempts to suppress ballads and songs were made. In April 1656, for instance, Nathaniel Brooks, a stationer, was examined by the Lieutenant of the Tower, as to how he came to possess and sell *Sportive Wit, The Muses Merriment*.<sup>3</sup>

I have ignored attempts to suppress early newspapers.

In 1662 the well-known 'Act for preventing the frequent abuses in printing seditious, treasonable and unlicensed Books and Pamphlets and for regulating of Printing and Printing Presses' was passed.<sup>4</sup> This act was based largely on the Decree of 1637, but one significant clause was inserted. Not only were the Master and Wardens of the Company empowered to search, but Messengers of his Majesty's Chamber, under the hand of one or more of the Secretaries of State, were given similar powers. This was important because general search warrants were illegal without statutory authority, although they were not finally declared to be so till 1765.<sup>5</sup> The soul of the new Act was the general Search Warrant'.<sup>6</sup> A general search warrant empowered the Messenger to search for dangerous books without specifying the particular book. In August 1663 Sir Roger L'Estrange, a fierce Tory, was appointed a licenser and given power to see that the provisions of the Act were enforced.<sup>7</sup> His energetic character

<sup>1</sup> The many Licensing Acts etc. of necessity had provisions in common. Those passed from 1643 till 1662 made less attempt to regulate the trade in detail than the Decree of 1637 and the Act of 1662. The Act of 1649 'was directed not against opinion, but against false news and misrepresentation of the proceedings and intentions of the government' (S. R. Gardiner, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate*).

<sup>2</sup> The amount of freedom allowed and the extent to which the laws and ordinances were obeyed, varied from time to time. The subject is a complicated one, and has not been fully investigated. Information will be found in J. B. Williams, *A History of English Journalism* and Hyder E. Rollins, *Cavalier and Puritan* (1923). See also S. R. Gardiner, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate*.

<sup>3</sup> Thurloe's *State Papers*, vol. iv, p. 717. See also *Cavalier and Puritan*, p. 11, for a petition in 1641 for the suppression of 'all vaine and ungodly books, ballads, love songs', etc.

<sup>4</sup> The Act became law on 2 June 1662. There were numerous provisions which limited the number of printers, apprentices and the like. The dwelling houses of peers were exempted from search except by special warrant. The rights of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, as regards the licensing of books printed in either place, were preserved, and provision was made for the supply of free books to the King's library and to Cambridge as well as to Oxford.

<sup>5</sup> Lord Camden in *Entick v. Carrington*.

<sup>6</sup> G. Kitchen, *Sir Roger L'Estrange* (1913), p. 128. The judges appear to have issued general warrants.

<sup>7</sup> *C.S.P.Dom.*, 1663/4, p. 240. The wording of the Warrant excepts his authority from certain classes of books such as Law and Divinity.

and his pamphlet, *Considerations and Proposals In Order to the Regulation of the Press* (1663),<sup>1</sup> had pointed to his being eminently suited to the position. He held the post of Surveyor of the Press till 1679, when on 26 May the Act, which had been renewed from time to time, was allowed to expire on the dissolution of the first Whig Parliament. It was renewed in 1685 and again in 1693, but the licensing laws gradually fell into disfavour, doubtless because they were found to be somewhat ineffective and because a more tolerant spirit prevailed. Probably the indiscretions of two successive licensors, 'Catalogue' Fraser and Edmund Bohun, were a contributory factor. Bohun left an interesting account of his troubles in his *Autobiography*. The Act finally expired on 3 May 1695.<sup>2</sup> The writings of Charles Blount, which contain passages from *Areopagitica*, made an impression which Milton's pamphlet had not.<sup>3</sup> Before the statutory restrictions on the Press were abolished Lord Guildford had pointed out that neither 'messengers of the press, and spies, who should discover secret printing-houses', nor the prosecution of hawkers were effective in dealing with books and pamphlets against the Government. He suggested that the Crown should set up counter-writers, whose business it should be to answer them. Roger North<sup>4</sup> says that his brother's advice was taken, and that the libellers were written out 'of the pit'. A somewhat similar course had been adopted to counteract the Royalist pamphleteers.<sup>5</sup> Dryden's *Absalom and Achitophel* (1681) and *The Medal* (1682) were the supreme examples of paper warfare on the Tory side. On the Whig side pamphleteering was carefully organized by Shaftesbury.

Now, it is easy enough to find out what the enactments were; but quite another matter to discover how far they were enforced or capable of being enforced. As entry of books on the *Stationers' Register* was part of the law,

<sup>1</sup> 'The most informative and perhaps forceful document of the seventeenth-century Press which we possess.' L'Estrange had called attention to private Printing Presses in his *Apology* (1660). He had in fact been made surveyor in February 1662, but this was 'the merest shadow of office'. (Kitchen's *Sir Roger L'Estrange*). For search warrants for particular books issued by the Secretary of State to L'Estrange, see *C.S.P. Dom.*, 1676/7, pp. 51, 81. For a graphic account of L'Estrange's methods, given by himself in evidence, see the trial of Twyn and others, *State Trials*, vol. vi (1810).

<sup>2</sup> See Macaulay's *History*, vol. iv, pp. 349 et seq., 542-4. For an account of Locke's arguments in favour of the abolition of licensing see H. R. Fox-Bourne, *Locke* (1876) vol. ii, p. 312, and *Macaulay*, vol. iv, p. 543.

<sup>3</sup> Blount published *A Just Vindication of the Learning and of the Liberty of the Press* just before the expiration of the Act in 1679. In 1693 he published *Reasons Humbly offered for the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing to which is subjoined the Just and True Character of Edmund Bohun*. The first part is signed 'J.M.'.

<sup>4</sup> *The Lives of the Norths* (1826 edition), vol. i, p. 319. Coffee houses were places in which libels were disseminated. See Clarendon's *Life*, vol. iii, p. 678, and the judge's opinion on coffee-houses in R. North's *Examen* (1740), p. 138. The distribution of libels was almost a profession for a time. One, Robert Julian, known as 'The Secretary to the Muses' was the best-known writer and distributor of libels: see my *Dryden Bibliography* and Mary C. Randolph's article in *Notes and Queries* (2 January 1943). A prosecution of Julian is recorded in Luttrell's *Brief Relation*, vol. i, p. 287.

<sup>5</sup> See Sir C. Firth's article on Nedham in the *D.N.B.*

the number of entries from time to time is some sort of guide. The entries fell when the Ordinances or Acts were not in force.<sup>1</sup> It is true the King issued proclamations to suppress seditious books, *e.g.* on 3 November 1679, but they probably had little effect.<sup>2</sup>

So much attention has been paid to the Licensing Laws as they affected Shakespeare that the position after the Act of 1662 has been relatively neglected. One can only point to a few of the factors which modified the working of the Act in practice. The Company was, in part, made responsible for preventing mischievous publications, but members of the Company, or more frequently printers employed by them, were often the publishers. As L'Estrange complained, the stationers were both parties and judges, and 'were entrusted to search for their own copies'. The royal monopolists were a difficulty.<sup>3</sup> L'Estrange had written with considerable vehemence against the stationers and printers who naturally did not give him all the assistance in their power.<sup>4</sup> He received varying degrees of support from different Secretaries of State.<sup>5</sup> No satisfactory provision was made for remunerating him for his arduous duties, which could not have been carried out satisfactorily without the co-operation of the stationers, as we shall see in the case of *The Rehearsal Transposed*. Exiles on the Continent<sup>6</sup> and traders from Scotland brought in seditious books. Secret presses were a source of trouble at all times.<sup>7</sup> Notwithstanding these many difficulties, Messengers of the Press were frequently successful in seizing seditious literature. But when the Act of 1662 expired in 1679, and the cry of 'No Popery' became almost universal, there was always a good chance that grand juries, if selected by the Whig Sheriffs of the City of London, would return a bill of *Ignoramus*.<sup>8</sup> In the years 1637-40 and 1677-80, after a display of energy and repression there was 'a period of comparative calm, broken in one case by the Civil War, in the other by the Popish Plot. Both led up to factious Parliaments, which swept away previous restraints and endorsed the view that such restraints were aids to Popery.'<sup>9</sup>

It will be seen that with the provisions of the Licensing Act and the law

<sup>1</sup> See Masson, vol. vi, p. 323, and A. W. Pollard, *The Library* (1922).

<sup>2</sup> James II issued a proclamation to the same effect on 10 February 1688 (Luttrell, vol. i, p. 431) although the Licensing Act had been renewed.

<sup>3</sup> Sam. Speed (for instance) had obtained a licence from the Archbishop of Canterbury to print the King's Primer, although James I had granted a monopoly to the Company to print all manner of primers, psalters, Psalms. *C.S.P. Dom.*, 1668/9, p. 280.

<sup>4</sup> In August 1669 the King instructed the Company to cease obstructing him. *C.S.P. Dom.*, 1668/9, p. 446.

<sup>5</sup> The surveyor's authority was derived from a Secretary of State—not from the Licensing Act itself. It therefore varied between 1663 and 1679.

<sup>6</sup> Libels printed abroad were always a trouble; see (for instance) Luttrell, vol. i, p. 434.

<sup>7</sup> See the Ordinances of the Company of 1678, *Arber*, vol. i, p. 15.

<sup>8</sup> The most famous example of a Grand Jury returning such a bill was in the trial of Shaftesbury for High Treason.

<sup>9</sup> Kitchen's *Sir Roger L'Estrange*, p. 101.

of seditious libel<sup>1</sup> combined there were periods when writers of biographies of contemporaries, or commentators on current affairs, were seriously handicapped if they wrote about persons likely to be protected by the Government.

The case was very different when the person libelled was of little importance, or not on the Government side. For although, as I have said, it was a criminal offence to libel anyone,<sup>2</sup> prosecutions, even if practicable, would have given little satisfaction to the victims.

After the Court of Star Chamber had to a large extent suppressed duelling, actions for defamation grew so common that they were discouraged by the Judges. In actions for slander the rules laid down had become so restrictive that, with very little caution, it was possible to say with impunity almost anything about a person one disliked. In the case of libel special damage had to be proved—often a very difficult matter—until 1670. In 1683 it was held that 'to say of anybody that he is a dishonest man is not actionable, but to publish so, or put it upon posts is actionable'.<sup>3</sup>

The necessity of proving that one has suffered pecuniary damage in the case of slander (spoken words), and not having to prove it in the case of libel (written words) continues to this day. The Law, as Sir F. Pollock put it, went wrong 'in making damage and not the insult the cause of action'.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, criticism of literature—and it is with pamphleteers that we shall mainly be concerned—was, says Professor P. H. Winfield, 'far more vitriolic in earlier days than it is now, because it was felt that the proper way of dealing with it was not to resort to the law courts but to meet it with something in print yet more stinging'.<sup>5</sup> It is extremely unlikely that

<sup>1</sup> It was during the years 1680-2 that the well-known trials for seditious libel of Benjamin Harris, Francis or 'Elephant' Smith, Henry Carr, Mrs. Cellier—the Popish Midwife—and Nathaniel Thomson took place. But as their pamphlets etc. had already been on sale, the trials could have made little difference except to the defendants. The trials will be found in *State Trials*. Printers' wives took an active part at the time. Jane Curtis published a libel on Scroggs. There are records of trials for seditious libel in other reports than the series of *State Trials*.

<sup>2</sup> The judges stated at the beginning of the Michaelmas term 1679 that 'Persons that do write or print or sell any pamphlet that is scandalous to publick or private persons, such books may be seized and the person punished by Law . . .'. Trial of Benjamin Harris, *S.T.*, vol. vii (1810).

<sup>3</sup> Holdsworth, vol. viii, p. 364, quoting *King v. Lake* (1670) and *Austin v. Culpepper* (1683). Peers, including bishops, had a special remedy for defamation. The offence of *Scandalum Magnatum* was created by Statute in 1275 and not formally abolished till 1888. Many prosecutions for the offence are recorded, between 1660-1700.

<sup>4</sup> To avoid any confusion I must remind the reader that when Professor Sisson writes that 'Pecuniary damages are no part of an Elizabethan suit' he is referring to proceedings which were in their nature criminal. I am writing now of Civil Actions.

<sup>5</sup> P. H. Winfield, *A Text-Book of the Law of Torts* (2nd edn., 1943). Cf. G. Spencer Bower, *A Code of Actionable Defamation* (2nd edn., 1923). In Bower's book, Dennis, Gildon, Dryden, Blackmore, Drummond, Milburne and others are mentioned. Of course, personal violence against a libeller was possible; but the assault on Dryden in Rose-Alley in 1679, because of his supposed part in *The Essay upon Satire*, was considered indecent

Shadwell could have maintained an action against Dryden because of the personal references to him in *MacFlecknoe*, *The Second Part of Absalom and Achitophel*, and *The Vindication of the Duke of Guise*. As late as 1825 Hazlitt's comments on Gifford would not, I suppose, have been considered libellous in a legal sense, though he calls him a 'low-bred, self-taught pedant' and describes him as admirably qualified for a *Quarterly Reviewer* 'by a happy combination of defects, natural and acquired'.

Luttrell's *Brief Relation* illustrates one or two of the points I have tried to stress. Luttrell was in the habit of recording legal proceedings. The *Relation* begins in September 1678, and between that date and 1684 he records a large number of trials for seditious libel or criminal libel of some sort. His record of prosecutions diminishes when the Licensing Act came into force again. He mentions very few civil actions for defamation between the years 1679 and 1689, although there are two for slander, one being against the Whig Sheriff Pilkington.<sup>1</sup>

In short the laws of criminal and civil libel were for long almost exactly the reverse of what they are now. To-day one can criticize the government and ministers with great freedom; whereas it is very risky to write about private persons, as many recent cases have shown.

Of course the laws against secret printing had been frequently disobeyed by Martin Marprelate and others in Elizabeth's time and after; and now and again fictitious stories of real people had been introduced into books. A well-known example is the account of the Earl of Surrey's travels in Italy (where he had never been) in Nashe's *Unfortunate Traveller* (1594).<sup>2</sup> But I think it is true to say that defamatory biography for political purposes was much more common after 1640 than it had been before. At any rate the four books I have mentioned at the beginning of this article were printed for the first time, or reprinted, as soon as the Star Chamber had lost control of the Press.<sup>3</sup> All are biographies, or contain accounts of people who by 1640 had become historical figures. The writing of history had hitherto been attended with difficulty. There had been trouble over Sir John Hayward's *Henry IV* (1599),<sup>4</sup> Sir Walter Raleigh's *History of the World* (1614) was nearly suppressed, and it was necessary to omit the

even in those days. To accuse a person of suffering from a venereal disease has always been actionable, without proof of pecuniary damage. It would be an interesting speculation as to whether anybody attacked by Pope, except Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, could have sued him for libel.

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i, p. 198.

<sup>2</sup> *The Works of Nashe*, ed. R. B. McKerrow. vol. iv., p. 253.

<sup>3</sup> 'The victory of the Parliament destroyed all this machinery for the control of the press, because it depended directly for its existence and motive power upon the prerogative of the Crown and upon the Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission.' Holdsworth, vol. vi, p. 370.

<sup>4</sup> Margaret Dowling, 'Sir John Hayward's trouble over the life of Henry IV', *The Library* (1930). E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, vol. i, pp. 353-5.

deposition scene in the quarto editions (1597, 1598) of Shakespeare's *Richard II* to avoid wounding the susceptibilities of Queen Elizabeth. Sir Charles Firth<sup>1</sup> gives other examples, and points out that it was Tacitus whom the Stuarts, like Napoleon, regarded as the most dangerous of all historians. There was another and more obvious difficulty when it came to writing contemporary history, to which Raleigh was fully alive. In the preface to his *History*, he says that he could have pleased the reader more if he had written the story of his own times, 'having been permitted to draw water as near the well-head as another'. He adds: 'To this I answer that who-so-ever in writing modern historie shall follow truth too neare the heels, it may happily strike out his teeth'. *Leycester's Commonwealth* (1641) was a libel, and although it is remembered because it contains the story of the murder of Amy Robsart, it is so grotesque in its accusations against Leicester that it is probably not of much account in the history of biography. However, the book illustrates the application of the law. It had originally been printed abroad in 1584, and had acquired the popular name of *Father Parsons' Green Coat*, from the green paper cover under which it was smuggled into England.<sup>2</sup> Its original title was *The Copeye of a letter Written by a Master of Arts of Cambridge*, etc. It was reprinted for political purposes, but even in 1641 objection was taken to it, I suppose because it reflected on a deceased member of the House of Lords. On 13 October 1641, the Secretary of State wrote to two Wardens of the Stationers' Company to tell them to stay its printing 'till the lords sit'.<sup>3</sup> But either because the Company no longer possessed the necessary powers, derived from the Star Chamber, or because the Lords did not, in fact, object, it appeared in quarto and octavo editions; and as it is still a fairly common book in both forms, a large number must have been printed.<sup>4</sup> Another work which was reprinted in 1641 was More's *Richard the Third*.<sup>5</sup> This is a garbled version of the life in the 1557 folio of More's *Works*, and

<sup>1</sup> *Essays Historical and Literary* (1938). See also Professor Nichol Smith's *Characters of the Seventeenth Century* (1918), where he quotes an illuminating conversation between Prince Henry and Hayward on the difficulty encountered by historians 'albeit they should write of one long since dead, whose posterity is cleane worn out'. Even such exemplary persons as Samuel Daniel and Drayton got into difficulties or felt themselves hampered by the law; see Kathleen Tillotson's 'Drayton and Richard II', *R.E.S.*, April 1939, and her notes (vol. v, pp. 111, 114) in the Shakespeare Head *Drayton*.

<sup>2</sup> I rely for this on E. M. Tennison's *Elizabethan England*, vol. v (1936). Sir S. Lee's statement in the *D.N.B.* that it was so known 'from the green-edged leaves of the original edition' is not true of the Bodleian copy.

<sup>3</sup> *Cal. S.P. Dom.*, 1641-3, p. 136.

<sup>4</sup> Neither edition of 1641 bears a printer's or stationer's name. Its scandalous nature, no doubt, accounted for its popularity. An edition entitled *Secret Memoirs of Robert Dudley Earl of Leicester with a Preface by Dr. J. Drake* was published in 1706.

<sup>5</sup> The life of Richard III forms the last part of a volume called *The Historie of the Pitiful Life and unfortunate Death of Edward the fifth, and the then Duke of York his brother, with the troublesome and tyrannical Government of usurping Richard the third and his miserable end written by Sir Thomas Moore Printed for the company of Stationers and are to be sold by Mich: Young. 1641.*

was produced to serve as a warning to tyrants, a theme which was popular at the time. Unlike *Leycester's Commonwealth*, there was nothing clandestine about its publication. The volume was printed for the Stationers' Company and is dedicated to Sir John Lenthall, Marshal of the King's Bench. As Mr. Stauffer<sup>1</sup> points out, More's *Richard the Third* is a most important book in the history of biography, as it is almost unique among royal biographies before 1688 in being hostile to, or at least highly critical of, its subject. Sir Robert Naunton's *Fragmenta Regalia* was made up of sketches of some of the eminent men of the Court of Elizabeth. It is somewhat critical in tone and is hostile to Leicester. Naunton had died in 1635, but had left a manuscript of his book in which he says, at the end, that he had taken care 'so to master my pen, that I might not (*ex animo* or of set purpose) discolour truth or any of the parts thereof, otherwise than in concealment'. It is doubtful if it could have been printed whilst the Press was controlled. But the most striking book which was published under the new freedom was Cavendish's *Life of Wolsey*.<sup>2</sup> Cavendish had died in 1561. The *Life* was printed in 1641, in a corrupt form, as a covert attack on Laud. An address which was added, evidently at the time of publication, begins: 'Who pleaseth to read this History advisedly may well perceive the immutability of honour, the tottering state of earthly dignity, the deceit of flattering friends and the instability of Princes favours'. Poor as the text is, its publication may have had a considerable influence on the art of biography as it is a vivid, and in its way, intimate account of Wolsey's life.

As I have already remarked, a book which did not reflect on the Government, or was favourable to it, was unlikely to be interfered with whatever it contained. *The Court and Character of King James written and taken by Sir A[nthony] W[eldon]*<sup>3</sup> (1650) contains a great deal of scandalous information about persons of the Court, as well as a vivid character of James I. It was entered on the *Stationers' Register* on 1 July 1650. The fact that a book replying to it, *Aulicus Coquinarie: or A Vindication in Answer to a Pamphlet Entituled The Court and Character of King James* (1650),<sup>4</sup> was also entered on the *Stationers' Register* and published, indicates that a fair amount of liberty was allowed at this time.

<sup>1</sup> Donald A. Stauffer, *English Biography Before 1700* (1930), p. 37. Many of the lives I mention are referred to in Mr. Stauffer's book, but he does not discuss them from the present angle.

<sup>2</sup> It was published as *The Negotiations of Thomas Woolsey The Great Cardinall of England Containing his life and Death viz. 1. The Originall of his promotion. 2. The Continuance of his Magnificence. 3. His Fall, Death and Buriall. Printed for William Sheeres 1641*. A correct text was first printed by Singer in 1825. Malone writing to Douce in 1809, mentioning the editions of 1641, 1667 and 1706, said they were basely sophisticated and interpolated originally in 1641 for the purpose of raising a clamour against the dignitaries of the Church and thus obliquely wounding Archbishop Laud. W. H. Dunn, *English Biography* (1916).

<sup>3</sup> Another edition, dated 1651, continues the attack on the Stuarts, their advisers, and favourites, into the reign of Charles I.

<sup>4</sup> By Sir W. Sanderson.

In his *Brief Relation*, Narcissus Luttrell has several entries such as : 'about this time the presses abound with all manner of libells, some on one side reflecting on severall ministers of state ; others against the late parliaments and ridiculing their proceedings'. In this instance he was writing of the middle of the year 1682 when, as we know, the Licensing Act was not in force. But what he says of this time was true, to a greater or less extent, of the period between the outbreak of the Civil War and the end of the century. Many of the books and pamphlets which I shall mention were freely sold, because they were attacks on persons holding views in opposition to the Government. The author of *Julian the Apostate* was prosecuted. It is doubtful if any of those defamed would have had a remedy for libel in a Civil Court.

The controversies between the different religious bodies during the Commonwealth produced numerous defamatory biographies. In 1649-50 an 'Act for the better Propagation and Preaching of the Gospel in Wales' was passed.<sup>1</sup> Commissioners were appointed with power to hear charges against the clergy of the Church in Wales, and the administration of the Act was entrusted to Major-General Harrison. His chief co-adjutor was Vavasor Powell. The proceedings of the Commissioners created much annoyance, which led to the publication of several attacks on Powell. The most notable was Alexander Griffith's *Strena Vavasoriensis. A New Years Gift for the Welsh Itinerants, Or a Hue and Cry after Mr Vavasour Powell* (1654). Griffith begins by saying, 'We beat on a strong quest, and must hunt dry foot after Mr V.P. a man that hath passed by no Person or Profession but hath either vilified the one, or traduced the other'. Powell's birth, his employment as an hostler, his marriage to a walking Pedlar, his insertion (so it is alleged) of his own name in the place of another's in the *Letters Missive* for his ordination, are described, and his persecution of others dilated upon. The 'saints' were very distasteful to the established clergy, and Griffith complains that Powell, to justify a 'sister' of his own congregation, who had wilfully drowned herself in a well near Welshpool, had preached a sermon in which he had stated 'that she was a saint in Heaven, and they who thought otherwise were wicked persons, and accursed ; that she came to her end by the motion of the Holy Spirit and that it happened often times when the Saints are filled with the spirit that they run into great pools instead of green meadows, and so embracing their saviour they make an end of their lives by Divine providence, and their souls are eternally saved'.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is only possible to touch on this controversy. Detailed studies will be found in books by Dr. T. Richards, such as his *Religious Developments in Wales* (1923) published by the National Eisteddfod Association.

<sup>2</sup> A favourable account of Powell, which contains a good deal of autobiography, was published in 1671 as *The Life and Death of Mr Vavasor Powell that faithful Minister and*

After the Restoration, attacks on leaders of the Parliamentary party appeared in abundance. The most obnoxious figure, as he remained till Carlyle's time, was, naturally, Cromwell. He was the object of both forms of defamatory biography. *The Syracusan Tyrant: or, the Life of Agathocles with some Reflections on the practices of our Modern Usurpers* (1661) is a good example of the 'parallel' type. *Flagellum: or the Life and Death, Birth and Burial of O. Cromwell . . .* (1663) is an equally good example of the other. It serves as a prototype of many later 'lives'. *Agathocles* is referred to in the preface; but in *Flagellum* Cromwell is said by the writer to be 'drawn in his proper and due proportions'. After giving details of his parentage, place of birth, etc., the author says: 'he was very notorious for robbing orchards; a puerile crime and an ordinary trespass, but grown so scandalous and injurious by the frequent spoiles and damages to trees, breaking of hedges and inclosures committed by this Apple-Dragon that many solemn complaints were made both to his father and master'. He is then accused of robbing dove-houses and later of 'drinking, wenching and the like outrages of licentious youth'. We are told that 'Ale-wives of Huntingdon when they saw him coming would use to cry out to one another, here comes young Cromwell, shut up your doors'. When he grew up it is said that 'better to prosper his own mens labours' the family was called every day to prayer, but 'they continued so long, that it was nine of the clock in the morning before they began their work; with the result that the hinds and plowman seeing this zeal of their master, which dispensed with the profitable . . . part of the day . . . thought they might borrow the other part for their pleasure, and therefor commonly they went to plough with a pack of cards in their pockets, and having turned up two or three furrows set themselves down to game till dinner time'. This account of Cromwell has been accurately described by Mr. Stauffer as 'an outstanding example of defamatory biography, plausible and realistic in its cool attempts at detraction'.

Another attack on a Parliamentary leader is: *Don Lamberto: Or, a Comical History of the Late Times . . . By Mantelion Knight of the Oracle* (1661).<sup>1</sup>

The book is a piece of buffoonery and is printed in Black Letter in imitation of romances such as *Bevis of Southampton*. A chapter-heading will suffice to show its nature. 'How Sir Lambert [Major General Lambert] "Knight of the Golden Tulip and Sir Vane" [Sir Henry Vane] Knight of the most mysterious allegories made a league together'.

*Confessor of Jesus Christ . . . with some Elegies and Epitaphs by his Friends*. Powell's 'sin' was watching games on Sunday. His conversion was attested by Stephen Marshall.

<sup>1</sup> This has been attributed to Thomas Flatman (*Ath. Ox.*, ed. P. Bliss, vol. iv, p. 245). The manuscript *Hand list of Wood's Collection of Printed Books* in the Bodleian probably contains many lives of the kind I am writing about. I have not found it possible to go through them.

The authorities would not have raised any objection to the books just mentioned at the time they appeared. There is some slight mystery about *Tomaso the Wanderer* (1667). If this book were really 'Licensed according to Order', as is stated on the title page, it suggests how little the licenser cared about books which criticized neither the Government nor the Church. Thomas Killigrew, the person attacked, was groom of the Bedchamber to, and a boon companion of, the King. He had certainly never been a decorous person, but Flecknoe's account of him exceeds the limits of ordinary criticism even though he omits a detailed account of Killigrew's debaucheries, which, he says, 'would offend all modest ears'.<sup>1</sup> It is an example of a book for which there was apparently neither civil nor criminal remedy.

Clergymen of the established Church and non-conformists carried on a vigorous campaign of mutual abuse. One pamphleteer in particular, Ralph Wallis, retailed or invented stories of parsons, especially if he considered them intemperate in their habits. The stories are generally supposed to be related by Wallis to Mrs. Wallis in bed. In *Room for the Cobbler of Gloucester and his wife . . . Printed for the author* (1668) there is a series of tales told of clergymen of the West of England after this manner. 'The Parson of Welsh Bicknor and Vicar of Walford in Herefordshire, by name Adams, being led home in the evening from Ross market, by two of his loving neighbours, who were his supporters, and seeing a glow-worm near or in the bottom of a hedge, and having a pipe of tobacco fill'd, pull'd it out, kneeled down and went to light his pipe of tobacco saying "Fire I hope, Fire I hope!"'<sup>2</sup> Stories of this sort about one's neighbours, circulated in pamphlets naturally evoked retaliation, and in the year following Wallis's death someone wrote *The Life and Death of Ralph Wallis, the Cobbler of Gloucester* (1670).

Books containing lives of rogues had taken on a new lease of life with the publication of *The English Rogue* by Francis Kirkman in 1666-8.<sup>3</sup> The author of the *Life of Wallis* says in his Preface that 'finding that the lives of . . . Lazerillous and other thieves and rogues were upon record, I thereupon resolved to picture this cobbler as near life as I could'. He proceeds

<sup>1</sup> G. Thorn-Drury in his introduction to the reprint of the only known copy (Dobell, 1925) suggests that Killigrew had incurred Flecknoe's wrath in the course of their relations as theatrical manager and play writer. The book was not entered on the Stationers' Register and has for imprint only 'Printed for the Author'; but the epistle has Flecknoe's name to it.

<sup>2</sup> I believe this story is older than this.

<sup>3</sup> This form of literature had originated in Spain. *Lazarillo de Tormes* (1553) was published in an English translation in 1586; the long and inferior *Life of Guzman de Alfarache*, in 1622. *The English Rogue* has some interesting accounts of the behaviour of piratical publishers; but F. W. Chandler in *The Literature of Roguery* (1907) was perhaps correct in finding that 'it neglects everything in the Spanish romances of roguery which made them a link in the development of the modern novel'.

to tell the reader that 'finding that as religion was a profitable craft it should be the first way for him to raise his fortune. . . . The Cobbler would whistle and sing psalms from four in the morning till twelve at night to the great disturbance of many weary travellers that lay near him, but by this means he got himself the reputation of a religious neighbour amongst the godly of Gloucester, who for his pretended piety let him have the mending of all their old shoes and gave him many a Sunday's dinner and afternoon luncheon.'

The well-known controversy between Marvell and Samuel Parker during the years 1672-3, in which other writers joined, was fruitful in personal allusions. Marvell's *Rehearsal Transpros'd*, especially the *Second Part* published in 1673, is the most amusing volume in the series. Marvell banters Parker rather than libels him; though nowadays the distinction would be considered rather a fine one. *The Second Part* is long, and I need only quote a short passage. After an account of Parker's life as an undergraduate at Oxford, Marvell explains that at the Restoration Parker continued to obstruct the Episcopacy. After leaving the University without taking a degree he went to London where 'he spent a considerable time in creeping into all Corners and Companies, Horoscoping up and down concerning the duration of the Government: not considering anything as best, but as most lasting and profitable. And after having many times cast a figure, he at last satisfied himself that the Episcopal Government would indure as long as this king lived, and from thenceforward cast about how to be admitted into the Church of England and find the highway to preferments'. *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* is of interest as it shows in what difficulties the Licenser might find himself. Marvell was substantially arguing for freedom in religious matters against insistence on conformity to the Church of England. Coventry examined L'Estrange as to why he had licensed the book. L'Estrange replied that he did not know of it till it was on sale. The Surveyor seized the second impression on Nathaniel Ponder's, the stationer's, premises. The Whig Earl of Anglesea told L'Estrange that the king had expressed displeasure at the seizure and directed L'Estrange to grant an *Imprimatur*, because the king had said that 'Parker had done him wrong, and this man [Marvell] had done him Right'.<sup>1</sup>

A pamphlet which probably had some popularity in its day was *The Life and Death of Stephen Marshall sometime Minister of the Gospel at Finch-  
ingfield in Essex* (1680).<sup>2</sup> Stephen Marshall was a Presbyterian, and as, like Wallis, he was 'a severe observer and immodest Publisher of other mens

<sup>1</sup> See Kitchen, *Sir Roger L'Estrange*, p. 192, where the facts and references are given. Nathaniel Ponder was, of course, the publisher of *The Pilgrim's Progress* (1678).

<sup>2</sup> There was another edition (or an issue with another title-leaf): *The Godley Man's Legacy to the saints upon Earth, Exhibited in the Life of . . . Mr Stephen Marshall . . . Printed in the Year, 1680*. There is an account of Marshall in the *D.N.B.*

rather  
autho  
of a 's  
forests  
of the  
more.  
The p  
educa  
Birds  
ness,  
break  
his a  
preac  
as a  
while  
thing  
a De  
tinu  
the f  
play  
expl  
treat  
dire  
expe  
and  
that  
R  
Lon  
biog  
his  
tran  
som  
die  
por  
pro  
T  
am  
diff  
cap  
pur  
the  
Rel

rather suppos'd than real crimes', he naturally had his detractors. The author of his life, who regarded him as a particularly objectionable example of a 'saint', tells us his history in some detail. He was writing, he says, to forestall a more charitable view, because he had seen the 'Lives of several of those seducers creep out of the Press', and every day expected to see more. Marshall is made to appear unworthy of any sort of canonization. The poverty of his father, who had been a glover at Godmanchester, his education at Emmanuel—'a Colledge that hath hatch'd too many such Birds'—though they have no relevance to Marshall's alleged worthlessness, are used to create prejudice in the reader's mind. He is accused of breaking a promise to get a better living and of using casuistry to support his action. He is said to work 'mightily upon women's affections' in his preaching. After discoursing on his marriage the author passes to his office as a minister. 'Tho' the Non-conformists counted him theirs yet all this while he was wary of hazarding his benefice by venturing in publick anything against the Establisht Government or Liturgy.' His failure to obtain a Deanery turned him into a Presbyterian, and so the detraction is continued for thirty pages. Marshall was a well-known figure, and no doubt the facts are more or less correct. It is the manner in which they are displayed which makes the pamphlet defamatory. It must be remembered in explanation of much of the violence with which the non-conformists were treated, that a large number of their countrymen thought of them as directly responsible for the miseries of the Civil War. When a man so experienced as Clarendon, who, on the whole, attempted to weigh people and events justly, had failed to see the causes of the War, it was unlikely that less experienced and smaller men would be clearer sighted.

Richard Baxter was another divine who was much attacked. Thomas Long's *Review of Mr Richard Baxter's Life* (1697) is polemical rather than biographical, as Mr. Stauffer says, but many of his references to Baxter in his *Review* are somewhat personal! 'Had not Mr Baxter told us the contrary we might have thought he had been born in Ireland, and nurst up by some ravening wolf, that could see the death of so many of his friends who died in the Rebellion and were like to perish eternally as well as temporally . . . some perhaps by his own hand, but many probably by his procurement without any regret.'

The Popish Plot and the discredit into which the witnesses fell gave ample opportunity for biography, which can be called defamatory with difficulty because Dangerfield, Bedloe and Titus Oates were hardly capable of being defamed.<sup>1</sup> But 'lives' of the first two based, like the life

<sup>1</sup> The lives of Dangerfield and Bedloe may have been written with some semi-legal purpose. The evidence of a person who had been convicted of a felony was invalid. For the attempt to render Oates and Bedloe incapable of giving evidence see Luttrell's *Brief Relation*, vol. i.

of Wallis, on picaresque fiction, were circulated as soon as the clamour had begun to die down. Probably Dryden's line on the Plot itself, 'Some truth there was, but brewed and dash'd with lies', is applicable to the stories told about Dangerfield and Bedloe.

*Don Tomazo, or the Juvenile Rambles of Thomas Dangerfield* (1680)<sup>1</sup> was the first to appear. In the 'address' the author refers to *Gusman* and *Lazarillo de Tormes*. In the book he gives an account of Dangerfield's entering into a conspiracy with one of his father's servants, called Jemmy, to steal horses so that they might run away to Scotland. They arrive at the house of Jemmy's father, near Moffatt, which does not at all come up to Jemmy's previous description of it. Jemmy's mother provides a 'Steam Bannock' but this leaves Dangerfield still hungry. Then he finds it is the custom in Scotland for the entire household to sleep in the same bed. This is uncomfortable, especially as the father gets hold of Dangerfield's cash. Various swindles by Dangerfield are described after this, and the story ends with his meeting Mrs. Cellier, the Popish Midwife.<sup>2</sup>

*The Life and Death of Captain William Bedloe* (1681) is a readable book, and certainly contains some information about Bedloe which is true. The writer professes to have undertaken the biography on the importunities of Bedloe himself. 'He was the more earnest with me, I suppose, because he knew I had the best knowledge of his Original, having liv'd for some years in the same house with his grandfather, and his father was my most intimate acquaintance and school fellow.' Whatever the author may really have known he gives an atmosphere of verisimilitude to his narrative.

It is doubtful if the publisher of either of these books would have escaped prosecution for seditious libel when belief in the Plot was at its height. In September 1679 a bookseller was sent to Newgate for publishing a book 'which scandalizes the king and government, reflects on the witnesses of the plot and endeavours to bring it to nothing'.<sup>3</sup>

Shaftesbury came in for his full share of abuse in books and pamphlets. The most amusing is *A Modest Vindication of the E of S—Y: In a Letter to a Friend concerning his being elected King of Poland* (1681). This describes in a jocular fashion the offer, supposed to have been made to him in 1675, of the throne of Poland. After various countries have been dismissed as

<sup>1</sup> *Dangerfields Memoirs, Digested into Adventures, Receipts and Expenses by his own Hand . . .* (1685), though published to expose 'his treasons, cheats, perjuries and other public misdemeanors', is a diary of Dangerfield's travels which, I suppose, was really printed from his papers.

<sup>2</sup> There was a shorter account of Dangerfield called *The Matchless Picaro: or, A Short Essay of the Fortune and Virtues of Seignior Don Tomazo Grandefieldo, alias Francisco De Corombono*. This was written (or purports to be written) by Mrs. Cellier herself, after her prosecution for the Meal-Tub Plot, the ludicrous appendage to the Popish Plot.

<sup>3</sup> *Brief Relation*, vol. i, pp. 21-2. Oates appeared before the Privy Council in September 1678: Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey was found dead on 12 October: Sir George Wakeman was acquitted in July 1679, and the credit of the witnesses was thenceforth impaired.

unlikely to furnish a suitable occupant for the throne the writer proceeds to say: 'you may imagine how quickly the eyes of the whole Diet were cast upon little England, and thereupon whom so soon as the Little Lord of S—Y'. Polish Deputies were immediately sent 'Post *incognita* with the Imperial Crown and Scepter in a cloak-bag to him'. This is followed by a list of his ministers which includes Dryden and Sir Robert Howard under names with supposed Polish endings.

*The Memoirs of the Life of Anthony Late Earl of Shaftesbury Printed for Walter Davis 1682* is described by Mr. Stauffer as derogatory. It is, but it is more political in character than a fictitious life.<sup>1</sup>

Titus Oates could, as I have said, hardly have been satirized. However, an attempt was made in *The Life of Titus Oates From his Cradle To his Pillory for Infamous Perjury* (1685). 'He went to the University of Cambridge where he was equally remarkable for his dulness and debauchery . . . He bought a gown of a Poor Taylor, and when he was dun'd for the money; He swore before his Tutor that he would take the sacrament upon it that he had pay'd him. Being asked by his Tutor how he came by so much money, since all money past through his hands, he said it was privately sent him by his Mother by a carrier . . . the carrier afterwards being called, he neither knew Oates or anything of the matter.'

A longer and more important pamphlet, *A Modest Vindication of Tites Oates the Salamanca Doctor from Perjury: By Adam Elliott*, had been published in 1682. Elliot, who was a respectable clergyman, gives a vivid description of his travels and an account of how he came to be involved in the Popish Plot, through the perjury of Oates.<sup>2</sup> By 1682 it was safe to attack Oates. Elliot's narrative begins with unqualified directness. 'In the year 1664 I was admitted into Caius College . . . where I continued until 1668, when commencing Batchelor of Arts, I obtained Letters Testimonial from our college . . . during my stay there, I remember Titus Oates was entered in our College; by the same token that the Plague and he both visited the University in the same year.'

The question of the succession to the Throne, should Charles II die before the Duke of York, raised violent controversy, which was prevented from leading to a second Civil War mainly by the skill of the King and the balanced policy of Halifax. Elkanah Settle, who was one of Dryden's butts, contributed his inevitable pamphlet, which he called *The Character of a Popish Successor* . . . (1682). This was answered by *The Character of the*

<sup>1</sup> Walter Davis, about whom not very much seems to be known, was the publisher of *Abalom and Achitophel* (1681), although Tonson, who published *The Medal* in 1682, was Dryden's regular publisher by 1681. It may be that Tonson did not feel sufficiently certain of how things were likely to go to be willing to undertake this great poetical 'libel'.

<sup>2</sup> Elliot brought an action against Oates for slander in which he claimed £500 damages. *Brief Relation*, vol. i, p. 159; but this was for words spoken by Oates.

*True Blue Protestant Poet* (1682). The author gives information about Settle's life which is in part true. 'He was indeed the reputed son of his Mother's Husband, a Barber in Dunstable, and his Mother sold ale; and because his family would not degenerate, or they thought themselves honoured in their Trade; the latter half of his generation are Barbers; he was designed for one; his Brother was a Barber, and his great Uncle that had him up, and gave him all he has is a Barber, now living in Hempstead, in Hertfordshire, well known by the name of Old Canon, or E.S.'. The writer then goes on to tell of Settle's attack on Otway and Otway's challenging him to a duel. Two years later, *Remarks Upon E. Settle's Narrative* was published with such comments as this: 'He has twice given it under his hand that his Mother was a Whore'.<sup>1</sup> Pamphlets of this sort would be of small importance did they not give us what little information we have about several seventeenth-century authors, although too much reliance has probably been placed on them by Malone and more recent writers.

Attacks on Jeffreys were common after his disgrace. *The Bloody Assizes: Or a Compleat History of the Life of George Lord Jefferies* (1689)<sup>2</sup> is a fairly accurate narrative of his life, but with stories inserted, which may have been true, although it seems unlikely that the writer would have known whether they were so or not. It is told by the author that Jeffreys being Chief Justice of the County Palatine of Cheshire, paid a visit to his father 'with a numerous train, which put the old gentleman into such a fret, for the drinking of his Cyder, and devouring his Provisions, that he charged him with the undertaking to ruin him, by bringing a whole country at his heels, commanding him never to attempt the like Prodigality again with hopes of success'.

A light touch was given to ecclesiastical controversy by Tom Brown. He employed his ingenuity in attacking, among others, William Sherlock. Although Sherlock was for a time a non-juror, he eventually took the oath of allegiance to King William, upon which Brown published *The Reasons for the New Converts Taking the Oaths to the Present Government* (1691). This pamphlet consists of a dialogue in which one of the characters says: 'tis a coach and six horses, I tell you, and nothing in the world else, that I can fancy, for you know a coach and six was Bishop Parker's best body of Divinity'. He then goes on to suggest that the future Dean of St. Paul's had been persuaded to comply during a course of curtain lectures.

A curious book, which is rare and little known, was published towards the end of the century. It is a parody of Gauden's *Eikon Basilike* and is entitled *Eikon Basilike Deutera. The Pourtraiture of His Sacred Majesty*

<sup>1</sup> 'For Almonds he'll cry whore to his own mother', *The Second Part of Absalom and Achitophel* (1682). I have included several of these pamphlets in my *Dryden Bibliography*.

<sup>2</sup> For an account of this pamphlet see Seymour Schofield, *Jeffreys of the Bloody Assizes* (1937), p. 308.

*King Charles II with his Reasons for turning Roman Catholick; published by K. James. Found in the Strong Box* (1694).

The papers supposed to have been found in 'the Strong Box'<sup>1</sup> were first published in 1686.<sup>2</sup> But the first part of *Eikon Basilike Deutera* (so far as I know) was not published till 1694, and is defamatory in the sense that it is an account of his own life bogusly attributed to Charles II. The book is anti-Roman-Catholic propaganda. It covers the King's reign from the time of his alleged conversion to Roman-Catholicism before he took the solemn League and Covenant, till the defeat of Shaftesbury's party in 1681. Prayers on Roman-Catholic models are scattered through the early chapters of the book, which contains stories of this sort. 'On his Majesty's being chid by the Cook-maid at Long-Marston for not winding the Jack aright, and calling himself a poor Farmers son' the King is made to reflect, 'How vain a thing is worldly Grandeur! and how little to be relied on . . . now instead of many thousands to wait on me, and put my commands in execution, I am forc'd to obey an ordinary Kitchen-wench, submit to her Reproof, and deny my quality, as St. Peter did his Master'.

It would be possible to enumerate a large number more of the 'lives' of the kind I have been recording, without touching on professional criminals, pirates, and highwaymen or even such characters as Colonel Blood who purloined the Crown jewels from a sense of grievance at what he considered the ill usage he had received.<sup>3</sup>

I will, in conclusion, refer to a few more books and pamphlets which were published, like the two in 1641, because they bore some obvious parallel to living people or to current events. The drama was used for political purposes. *The Duke of Guise*, acted at the end of 1682 and published early in 1683, is one of the best-known political plays. It has been fully discussed in editions of Dryden, and I need not say much about it here. In its *Vindication* (1683), which Dryden felt compelled to write, he says that the title had originally been *The Parallel*, but he found the name already in use for a pamphlet. He and his collaborator Lee intended 'to make the old play' (he had written portions in his early days) 'a Parallel betwixt the Holy League plotted by the house of Guise and its Adherants with the Rebels in the time of King Charles the First, and those of the new Association,<sup>4</sup> which was the spawn of the old Covenant'. The Duke of Guise's sudden return to Paris after he had been banished was so like Monmouth's return to London, that Dryden's enemies (including Shad-

<sup>1</sup> 'Boxes' containing papers were an important feature in the politics of the Restoration.

<sup>2</sup> *My Dryden Bibliography*.

<sup>3</sup> *Remarks on some Eminent Passages in the Life of the Famed Mr Blood* (1680).

<sup>4</sup> The Association had been the basis of the indictment of Shaftesbury. The similarity in the situation between these troubled years and 1641 was obvious. Luttrell writes of people 'crying out forty and forty one'. *Brief Relation*, vol. i, p. 198.

well) complained to the Lord Chamberlain. The play was acted in the end, although Dryden's specious explanation would not have convinced the authorities, had they seriously wanted to prohibit it.

The Rev. Samuel Johnson (Dryden's Ben Jochanan) was a man with great capacity for political argument, and his *Julian the Apostate Being a Short Account of His Life; The sense of the Primitive Christians about his Succession . . . Printed for Langley Curtis* (1682) evoked a number of replies. His book contains a life of Julian, as well as a direct attack on those who were unwilling to support the Exclusion Bill. Among the answers were *A Life of Jovian* (1683) and the *Life of Boetius* (1683). It also evoked one of the most cutting of Dryden's lines, 'They got a villian and we lost a fool'. *Julian the Apostate* was treated as a seditious libel<sup>1</sup> and Johnson was ordered to pay 500 marks for writing it, though after the Revolution the conviction was declared illegal. Johnson replied to his detractors in 1689 with *Julian's Arts To Undermine . . . Christianity . . .* He says that it was written in 1683, 'and has since lain Buried under the Ruines of those English Rights which it endeavours to defend'. The Licensing Act had been renewed, but as William III was on the throne, it was 'Licensed and Entered according to Order'.<sup>2</sup>

The last book belonging to the 'parallel' type of biography I shall mention was by Sir Robert Howard, Dryden's brother-in-law. It is called *The History of the Reigns of Edward and Richard II with Reflections and Characters of their Chief Ministers and Favourites. Written in the Year 1685 . . . Printed for Thomas Fox 1690*. Sir Robert had always kept abreast of the times, and he wrote this book as an attack on 'Those Fatal Methods and Arbitrary Designs of Charles II and James II'. In his preface he says that in 1685 he perceived how exactly their reigns 'followed the steps of Edward and Richard', and that he expected to see a Revolution resembling theirs. 'There was not', he adds, 'a particular action of any note of the two late Kings that did not seem copy'd from those two unfortunate Princes'.

Finally a brief reference must be made to one of the best-known libels of the century. This was a serious libel, though probably made in good faith. In Wood's *Athenae Oxoniensis*, vol. ii (1692), statements accusing Clarendon of corruption were introduced in the lives of David Jenkins and John Glynne.<sup>3</sup> Clarendon was dead and could not therefore be legally libelled. But his son Henry, second Earl of Clarendon, forced the University to prosecute Wood in the Vice-Chancellor's Court, and Wood was expelled the University.

<sup>1</sup> Luttrell's *Brief Relation*, vol. i, pp. 287, 300.

<sup>2</sup> Dryden's lines in *The Second Part of Absalom and Achitophel* were no doubt very damaging to Johnson. They certainly were a libel, if, as there is no reason to doubt, John Hampden's praise of Johnson, printed in his *Works* (1710) and quoted by Scott, is justified.

<sup>3</sup> Pp. 221, 269.

## THE AESTHETIC SENSE AND TASTE IN THE LITERARY CRITICISM OF THE EARLY EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

By R. L. BRETT

AESTHETICS as a separate and autonomous study did not begin in England until the end of the seventeenth or the beginning of the eighteenth century. It was not until the last quarter of the seventeenth century that literary criticism began to become a self-conscious study, and to examine the assumptions on which it was itself founded. The main reason for this may be traced in the breakdown of authority and the attempt to base literature on sanctions which rested in the new theory of knowledge and in a philosophy which had been erected on a study of the processes of the human mind. Once the authority of the Ancients had been abandoned criticism had to find the presuppositions on which it could base its enquiries. An early example of what was happening can be seen in Hobbes's *Answer to Davenant* (1651), whose author used the findings of the new psychology to formulate his famous judgement-fancy theory of literary composition.<sup>1</sup>

As soon as criticism began to look for presuppositions on which it could rest its own activities the rival claims of Reason and Taste at once confronted it. It is a popular misconception to think that the late seventeenth century or the Age of Anne was the Age of Reason and that all literary disputes of the time were settled by an appeal to reason. I have attempted elsewhere<sup>2</sup> to develop the suggestion that the nature of criticism during this period may be described more accurately by the term 'reasonable' than 'reason' and that the appeal was rather to 'good-sense' than reason as such. Literary criticism at this time was concerned rather to make a work of art acceptable to men's experience than to identify literary invention with the faculty of intellection. The most widely held belief was that literary composition was the product of both the judgement and the fancy, while in practice the criterion of whether a work of art was good or bad was whether it conformed to experience and reflected the popularly accepted values. It is true that some critics emphasized one side of the

<sup>1</sup> *English Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. J. E. Spingarn, Oxford, 1908, II, 59.

<sup>2</sup> R. L. Brett, 'The Third Earl of Shaftesbury as a Literary Critic', *Modern Language Review*, XXXVII, No. 2, April 1942, p. 136. It will be found in one or two instances that I have used and elaborated statements made in the previous essay. This, it is hoped, will be accepted as an indication of consistency and not indolence.

judgement-fancy antithesis and some the other. But at the end of the seventeenth century there was a growing body of critics who emphasized taste in the sense of personal preference and individual sensibility. Dennis, Temple, Gildon and Farquhar are all writers who stressed the importance of taste. Moreover, there was an increasing tendency in criticism to judge a work of art not so much by the established rules as by its effectiveness, and this was strengthened by the growing belief that literature was the product of historical and economic factors and that the rules themselves were susceptible to change along with the times. Added to this was the notion that a play or poem could have a charm incapable of being analysed or explained but which was recognized by the reader's or spectator's sensibility. Such a notion gave rise to and was popularized in the doctrine of the *je ne sais quoi*. Pope expressed it in familiar lines in his *Essay on Criticism* where he deliberately excludes this charm from the scope of the judgement:

And snatch a grace beyond the reach of art,  
Which, without passing thro' the judgment, gains  
The heart, and all its end at once attains.

But although in practice this tension between judgement and fancy, reason and taste, could be resolved by the compromise of an appeal to experience, or by giving due recognition to both, there was at the back of the practical solution a logical difficulty which had to be considered. Those who upheld taste recognized that aesthetic pleasure is a feeling, and yet the supporters of reason claimed that if the aesthetic judgement were to be universally valid it must be made at the bar of the reason. When one man says that he considers a picture beautiful he implies or assumes that other people do or should consider it beautiful as well. He is not merely concerned with his own reactions. Similarly when two people disagree about a piece of music and one of them says that it is beautiful and the other takes the opposite view, it is felt that one of the parties must be right and the other wrong. In other words we think that aesthetic judgements are universal judgements and have a universal application and validity. But how can this be if the aesthetic pleasure is the concern only of the feelings, and the judgement is formulated by them? It was this question which perplexed so many of the eighteenth-century critics and which lies at the back of so much criticism of the period. It was not until Kant that any really satisfactory answer was given to the question, and all previous attempts to answer it were prejudiced by an improper appreciation of the nature of the question or were evasions of the real difficulty. Kant's answer, so far as one can state it briefly and without reference to the system of his philosophy, is that although aesthetic judgements have a universal validity, their universality is a subjective and not an objective one. While our logical and

practi  
someth  
are 'di  
and d  
judge  
The e  
clearl  
claim  
poun  
much  
was t

It  
pract  
and  
is no  
refle  
sever  
cour  
phra  
who  
actio  
reall  
part  
wor  
onc  
judg  
iden  
iden  
mo

c  
s  
l  
K  
s  
a  
n  
eve  
thi  
tas  
Th  
M  
wh  
mi

practical judgements are universal they are also objective and predicate something of their objects. Our aesthetic judgements, on the other hand, are 'disinterested' in the sense that they are independent of any interest in, and do not predicate anything of, their objects. But although our aesthetic judgements are subjective they are universally valid and apply to all men.<sup>1</sup> The early eighteenth-century critics did not see the nature of the problem clearly but they all recognized a difficulty in the apparently irreconcilable claims of the feelings and reason. One theory in particular which was propounded as a solution of the problem achieved a great popularity and did much to cast the mould which shaped eighteenth-century criticism. This was the doctrine of the aesthetic sense.

It is always difficult to say how far theory modifies practice and how far practice gives rise to and helps to formulate theory. In most cases theory and practice proceed to the enrichment and development of both. There is no doubt that the doctrine of the aesthetic sense was the outcome and reflection of certain developments in the practical criticism of the late seventeenth century. But the doctrine in turn affected the subsequent course of criticism. We are familiar with the idea of a moral sense. The phrase would first seem to have been used by the third Earl of Shaftesbury, who in his moral philosophy develops the view that we can only judge an action to be good if it evokes the approval of the moral sense.<sup>2</sup> He never really makes clear what he means by this moral sense and tries to make it partake of the nature of reason and feeling. He does tell us, however, that it works immediately and spontaneously. We see a character or action and at once this sense makes a moral judgement. The same thing happens with judgements of beauty according to Shaftesbury, for the moral sense is identical with the aesthetic sense, in the same way that beauty and good are identified in his philosophy. Taste, for him, is as much concerned with morals as it is with the arts:

Is there then . . . a natural beauty of figures? and is there not as natural a one of actions? No sooner the eye opens upon figures, the ear to sounds, than straight the beautiful results and grace and harmony are known and acknowledged. No sooner are actions viewed, no sooner the human affections and passions discerned (and they are most of them as soon discerned as felt) than straight an inward eye distinguishes and sees the fair and shapely, the amiable and admirable, apart from the deformed, the foul, the odious, or the despicable.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 'It follows that there must be attached to the judgment of taste a claim to validity for everyone, since in making it we become conscious that it is detached from all interest. But this validity must not be a universality which is referred to objects, i.e. the judgment of taste must be bound up with a claim to subjective universality.' Kant, *Critique of Judgment*. The passage is quoted by H. W. Cassirer, *A Commentary on Kant's Critique of Judgment*, Methuen, 1938, p. 188, which gives an excellent account of Kant's theory.

<sup>2</sup> Shaftesbury uses the actual phrase 'moral sense' in his *Inquiry Concerning Virtue* which formed part of the *Characteristics*, 1711, but which was published without his permission in 1699.

<sup>3</sup> 'The Moralists', *Characteristics*, II (ed. J. M. Robertson, London, 1900), p. 137.

This doctrine of the aesthetic sense, however, does not solve the problem. The nature of this sense and its relation to the reason and feelings is left too vague. If it is really a sense in the same way as our other senses, it leaves the aesthetic judgement as relative as it found it and there would be no more universal validity about our aesthetic judgement than in our tastes concerning food and drink. There could in fact be no standard by which to judge works of art. Yet although the doctrine did not answer the philosophical question it provided a way out of the *impasse* for subsequent writers.

It is interesting to note how many critics after Shaftesbury accept the belief in the existence of a special aesthetic sense. The term is not used with any great precision, and very often the writers who adopt it are vague about its exact meaning. Leonard Welsted, for example, tells us, in *The State of Poetry*, that

Many of the Graces in Poetry may, I grant, be talk'd of in very intelligible Language, but intelligible only to those who have a natural *Taste* for it, or are born with the Talent of judging: To have what we call *Taste*, is having, one may say, a new Sense or Faculty superadded to the ordinary ones of the Soul, the Prerogative of Fine Spirits!<sup>1</sup>

Hutcheson's *Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*, 'In which the Principles of the late Earl of SHAFTESBURY are Explained and Defended',<sup>2</sup> bases a belief in this sense upon the immediacy of the aesthetic apprehension and its seeming independence of any process of reasoning.

This superior Power of Perception [*i.e.*, the aesthetic appreciation] is justly called a *Sense*, because of its Affinity to the other Senses in this, that the Pleasure does not arise from any Knowledge of Principles, Proportions, Causes, or of the Usefulness of the Object; but strikes us at first with the Idea of Beauty: nor does the most accurate knowledge increase this measure of Beauty, however it may super-add a distinct rational Pleasure from prospects of Advantage, or from the Increase of Knowledge.<sup>3</sup>

John Gilbert Cooper adds to the vagueness of the concept by talking about 'that internal Sense we call TASTE'.<sup>4</sup>

Blair's *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, which were gathered together and published in 1783, define taste as an internal sense distinct from any process of reasoning.

<sup>1</sup> Welsted, *The State of Poetry*, 1724; *Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century*, ed. W. H. Durham, Yale University Press, 1915.

<sup>2</sup> From the title-page.

<sup>3</sup> *Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*, 1725, p. 10. It is interesting to see here as in Shaftesbury's *Moralists* a hint of Kant's theory of the 'disinterestedness' of the aesthetic judgment. Interesting discussions on Kant's relations to the English critics of the eighteenth century may be found in the Introduction to J. C. Meredith's translation of the *Critique of Aesthetic Judgment* (Oxford 1911) and E. F. Carritt's *Addison, Kant and Wordsworth in Essays and Studies* for 1936.

<sup>4</sup> *Letters Concerning Taste* (published anon., 1755, but known to be by Cooper), Letter I.

Taste may be defined 'The power of receiving pleasure from the beauties of nature and art'. The first question that occurs concerning it is, whether it is to be considered as an internal sense, or as an exertion of reason? Reason is a very general term; but if we understand by it, that power of the mind which in speculative matters discovers truth, and in practical matters judges of the fitness of means to an end, I apprehend the question may be easily answered. For nothing can be more clear than that Taste is not resolvable into any such operation of Reason . . . a beautiful prospect or a fine poem . . . often strike us intuitively and make a strong impression, when we are unable to assign the reasons of our being pleased. . . . Hence the faculty by which we relish such beauties seems more a-kin to a feeling of sense, than to a process of the understanding.<sup>1</sup>

Blair believes that there is a standard of taste and that we can say whether a man's taste is good or bad. Yet on the other hand he wishes to give due recognition to individual preferences in judgements of taste. Truth he tells us is one, but beauty can be many.

It is not in matters of Taste, as in questions of mere reason, where there is but one conclusion that can be true, and all the rest are erroneous. Truth which is the object of reason is one; Beauty which is the object of Taste, is manifold.<sup>2</sup>

But this does not get him out of the difficulty and applies only when men are discussing different objects: when they are discussing the same object and come to different conclusions one must be right and the other wrong in the judgement he makes. The only solution that Blair can see is to set up as a criterion the general consensus of opinion throughout the ages.

That which men concur the most in admiring, must be held to be beautiful.<sup>3</sup> This is the view which Dryden had expressed, and it is met with frequently in the writers of the eighteenth century.<sup>4</sup> But it is no solution really. One man may be right against the majority and in such a case there must be some other criterion on which he bases his judgement.

The doctrine of an aesthetic sense, however, did play its part in shaping the form that eighteenth-century criticism took. It gave to criticism an experiential emphasis. Those who tell us that the eighteenth century tried to reduce its art criticism and appreciation to rational principles are quite wrong. The underlying principle of eighteenth-century criticism is its appeal to experience. This is not entirely because English critics reflect the general empirical tendency of contemporary philosophy. The empirical philosophy was coldly inimical to the values of art, as can be seen in the

<sup>1</sup> Blair, *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, 1783, Lecture II.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> It is modified in some authors to the view that the general consensus of all cultured opinion is the criterion, e.g. Dennis in *A Large Account of the Taste in Poetry*, 1702, says, 'To conclude that a Play is good because Mr. Granville is pleased by it, is but a reasonable way of arguing. But to say, that it is good because it pleases the generality of an Audience is a very absurd one'. (Durham, *Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century*, pp. 128-9). That is, the appeal is to culture and sensibility. See below, p. 207 et seq.

work of a man like Hume. Furthermore, criticism in France was also tending the same way, and yet French philosophy was rationalist and not empirical. Doubtless there were French critics who were influenced by English thought, but it is likely that the debt, if it existed, was to English critics rather than philosophers. One cannot help feeling that the doctrine of an aesthetic sense was partly responsible for tying criticism down to the actual and concrete, and for giving it that concern for experience rather than laws which was one of its chief characteristics in the eighteenth century. Johnson, who represents his age in so much, speaks for many when he insists that criticism must base itself on the actual experience of men, and not be content with applying *a priori* rules to a work of art. In speaking of Mrs. Elizabeth Montagu's *Essay on . . . Shakespear* he says:

No, Sir, there is no real criticism in it: none shewing the beauty of thought, as formed on the workings of the human heart.<sup>1</sup>

And Blair summarises the critical presuppositions of the period when he writes:

But, though reason can carry us a certain length in judging concerning works of Taste, it is not to be forgotten that the ultimate conclusions to which our reasonings lead, refer at last to sense and perception.<sup>2</sup>

The confusion that beset the assigning of aesthetic judgements to a sense is seen in the writings of many critics. It is difficult to indicate in what way such a sense can be related to the reason, and so a distinction is made between two kinds of beauty, one of which is directly apprehended by this sense and the other and more subtle kind which only the reason can discern. Instead, that is, of trying to combine the two faculties of appreciation, beauty itself is divided into two kinds, each of which corresponds to one of the faculties. Addison seems to be the first to make the distinction, in the *Spectator* for June 1712.

But there is nothing that makes its way more directly to the Soul than Beauty, which immediately diffuses a secret satisfaction and complacency through the Imagination, and gives a finishing to any thing that is great or uncommon. The very first discovery of it strikes the mind with an inward joy, and spreads a cheerfulness and delight through all its faculties . . . there are several modifications of matter which the mind, without any previous consideration, pronounces at first sight beautiful or deformed. . . . There is a second kind of Beauty that we find in the several products of art and nature, which does not work in the Imagination with that warmth and violence as the beauty that appears in our proper species, but is apt however to raise in us a secret delight, and a kind of fondness for the places or objects in which we discover it. This consists in either the gaiety or variety of colours, in the symmetry and proportion of parts, in the arrangement and disposition of bodies, or in a just mixture and concurrence of all together.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Boswell's *Life*, ed. G. B. Hill, Oxford, 1887, II, p. 88.

<sup>2</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> *Spectator* No. 412.

Hutcheson in his *Inquiry* makes the distinction much more explicit. Beauty is for him of two kinds. The one is what he calls Original or Absolute, the other is Comparative or Relative. The first is apprehended in an immediate act of awareness by the aesthetic sense. The other pertains only to the imitative arts, and is apprehended when the work of art is compared to the original. That is, a relationship is perceived and this must be by an act of reason.

We therefore by Absolute Beauty understand only that Beauty, which we perceive in Objects without comparison to any thing external, of which the Object is suppos'd an Imitation, or Picture; such as that Beauty perceiv'd from the Works of Nature, artificial Forms, Figures, Theorems. Comparative or Relative Beauty is that which we perceive in Objects, commonly considered as Imitations or Resemblances of something else.<sup>1</sup>

The two kinds of beauty described by Hutcheson are not identical with those that Addison distinguishes. But both bear witness to the fact that in some cases beauty is immediately apprehended, and in others is seen only after reflexion and consideration of the object. Hutcheson would seem, however, to be wrong in thinking that the latter kind is limited to our appreciation of the imitative arts only. Even when we look at natural beauty, such as a landscape, our appreciation is often heightened by seeing the relations of the parts to each other and to the whole, by grouping and balancing the various elements; that is, by an act of reason. The distinction not only explains a feature of our experience, it is also part of the attempt to reconcile the reason and the feelings and to give a due place to both. The distinction, once it had been made, is found expressed in many, if not most, critics of this century. We find it made by Hume in his youthful work *A Treatise of Human Nature*, published in 1738, in which he distinguishes between the beauty of the imagination and the beauty of sense. Bosanquet draws attention to this and speaks of it as a 'pregnant distinction' without seeming to realize that it had already been anticipated, if less subtly developed, by Hume's predecessors.<sup>2</sup> Later, John Gilbert Cooper makes the same point,<sup>3</sup> and Henry Home and William Shenstone follow him.

Considering attentively the beauty of visible objects, we discover two kinds. The first may be termed *intrinsic* beauty, because it is discovered in a single object viewed apart without relation to any other: . . . The other may be termed *relative* beauty, being founded on the relation of objects.<sup>4</sup>

It may be convenient to divide beauty into the absolute and relative. Absolute is the above mentioned [*i.e.*, it appeals directly through the senses].

<sup>1</sup> *An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*, 1725, p. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Bosanquet, *History of Aesthetic*, London 1892, p. 179.

<sup>3</sup> *Letters Concerning Taste*, 1755, Letter I.

<sup>4</sup> Henry Home, *Elements of Criticism*, 1762, Vol. I, p. 244.

Relative is that by which an object pleases, through the relation it bears to some other.<sup>1</sup>

It will be noticed that nearly all the above quotations either identify the aesthetic sense with taste, or relate the two terms. 'Taste' belongs to a class of words of which each period possesses examples. Such words are sufficiently vague to bear a variety of meanings or shades of meaning. An example known to our own day is the word 'liberal', which has a range of meanings stretching between the extremes of abuse and praise. The ambiguity of such a word generally betokens a shift of emphasis and a historical development in the field in which the particular word is used. One meaning is used less frequently and fades gradually away while another becomes the popularly accepted one. The word 'taste' is not only highly ambiguous, but when applied to art is fraught, like the term 'aesthetic-sense', with all the dangers of metaphorical language. It can either mean the mere personal preference of the individual, or it can signify a universal standard based on some more ultimate sanction such as 'nature', 'reason', or 'common-sense'. These two conceptions are contradictory and thus the same word can be used to describe opposite things. It can also adopt a variety of shades of meanings between these two extremes.

There was no definite School of Taste in England at the end of the seventeenth century, but there were features in the criticism of the time, which, taken together, form a tendency to emphasize taste to a much greater degree than previous ages had yet done. The first of these, which is a feature of all good criticism, is the insistence that there is a beauty in art unattainable by the rules alone. The distinction between application and genius has always been present in criticism. But it was now given a new slant. This 'certain Air and Spirit which perhaps the most Learned and judicious in other Arts do not perfectly apprehend' and which is not 'attainable by any Study or Industry',<sup>2</sup> is the prerogative of the men of taste. Temple, Gildon, Farquhar, Dennis and others all emphasize this in varying degrees. Dennis goes so far as to tell us that

. . . that which is commonly called good sence, is not sufficient to form a good tast in Poetry, tho' the good sence should be joyn'd with an inclination for Poetry, and with a tolerable share of experience in it: For if this were sufficient, it would undeniably follow, that all who have this Experience, this Inclination, and this good Sence, would have the same tast: whereas it is manifest that they who are not without these qualities, differ very considerably in their opinions and in their tastes of Verses and Poems.<sup>3</sup>

It was soon felt, however, that there must be a standard by which taste

<sup>1</sup> Shenstone, *Essays on Men and Manners*, first published 1764-9; the passage quoted may be found in 1802 edn., p. 252.

<sup>2</sup> Edward Phillips, Preface to *Theatrum Poetarum*, 1675; Spingarn, *English Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, II, p. 271.

<sup>3</sup> Dennis, *Remarks upon Prince Arthur* (1696), p. 41.

itself could be judged and which would raise it from the level of mere liking and disliking. George Farquhar, with a touch of irony, draws the attention of his fellow writers to the position in which criticism has placed itself.

Now here are a multitude of Criticks, whereof the twentieth Person only has read *Quae Genus*, and yet every one is a Critick after his own way; that is, Such a play is best, because I like it. A very familiar Argument, methinks, to prove the Excellence of a Play, and to which an Author wou'd be very unwilling to appeal for his Success: Yet such is the unfortunate State of Dramatick Poetry, that it must submit to such Judgments; and by the Censure or Approbation of such variety it must either stand or fall.<sup>1</sup>

But it is not the *a priori* act of reason which is called in to decide the standard of taste. Nor is it the consensus of opinion through the ages or even an appeal to men's experience. The only way, it was considered, by which a standard of taste or criterion of judgement could be erected was to ground it upon artistic sensibility. The opinion of those who can enter into and share, to some extent at any rate, in the act of artistic creation is the only sure one. Dennis and Farquhar both came to the same conclusion in essays, both of which were published in 1702.

This, I think, Sir, need not be disputed, that for the judging of any sort of Writings, those talents are in some measure requisite, which were necessary to produce them.<sup>2</sup>

and Farquhar asks:

Is it reasonable that any Person that has never writ a Distich of Verses in his life, shou'd set up for a Dictator in Poetry; and without the least Practice in his own Performance, must give Laws and Rules to that of others?<sup>3</sup>

Not only should the critic be, as far as possible, one who can enter into the creative processes of the poet's mind, it is necessary that he should be cultured. No longer is the critic required to be a philosopher who can lay down laws for poetic composition. The essential qualification is artistic sensibility. Farquhar, after a long tirade against Aristotle's claim to be a critic, ends with these words:

I have talk'd so long to lay a Foundation for these following Conclusions; *Aristotle* was no poet, and consequently not capable of giving Instructions in the Art of Poetry; his *Ars Poetica* are only some Observations drawn from the works of *Homer* and *Euripides*, which may be meer Accidents resulting casually from the Composition of the Works, and not any of the essential Principles on which they are compil'd.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Farquhar: *Discourse upon Comedy*; Durham, *Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century*, p. 259.

<sup>2</sup> Dennis, *A Large Account of the Taste in Poetry*, 1702; Durham, *Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century*, p. 133.

<sup>3</sup> Farquhar, *Discourse upon Comedy*, 1702; Durham, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 271-2.

This disregard of the rules and the Ancients, and the new emphasis laid on effectiveness, became increasingly popular at the end of the seventeenth century. In the conception of the critic as a man of liberal culture with sensibility, or with an actual experience of the act of artistic creation, is seen the beginning of the Romantic attitude, which understands the critic's function to be a re-creation of the emotional experience the poet himself expresses. In the work of Hobbes, Davenant and Dryden an attempt was made to deal with literature as the product of the writer's mind, and with them we meet the first real discussions in English criticism of the mental processes which give rise to literature. That part of critical terminology which deals with these processes was subjected to a stricter scrutiny, and such terms as 'wit', 'fancy', 'invention', 'imagination', etc., were invested with new and more precise shades of meaning. Side by side with this went on research in natural science, philology and archaeology, and many of the critics combined activities in these spheres with their literary interests. Research of this kind tended to stress the relativeness of literature and helped to bring about an attitude which regarded literature as the product of historical, national and political forces. I shall return to this point later.

This digression back to the seventeenth century is important in showing that the concept of Taste, in the sense of individual predilection, had already been adopted and found to be as embarrassing as it was useful. Henceforward the problem was going to be, as we have seen in discussing the aesthetic-sense, how to give due place to the feelings in aesthetic appreciation and at the same time preserve the universality of the aesthetic judgement. Once the idea of taste had been conceived it was used to express individual feeling rather than generalized sentiment. The treatises of the middle of the eighteenth century were directed against this distrust of a general standard of taste. They were attempts to rescue the concept from the chaos of personal sensibility and to erect a standard and principles of taste. But the rational basis of criticism had been deeply undermined, and there is not a critic in this so-called Age of Reason who does not allow a more than proportionate place to the feelings. The very ambiguity of the word enabled critics to be unaware of the logical implications of their own utterances, and very often the critics who ostensibly preach a doctrine of taste based upon the reason are the very ones to help identify it with emotion.

But although the notion of taste tended to move away from rational principles we must not over-simplify the matter and explain eighteenth-century criticism as merely a decline of rationalism and an increasing regard for the emotions. Most critics of the time were influenced by the idea of taste, while the predominant feature of their writings, as has been

indicated, is not the appeal to reason or the emotions, but to experience. Yet there is truth in the assertion that a greater emphasis was placed on the feelings. The shift of emphasis can be seen in the changing concept of nature. Nature was a concept on which critics throughout the entire century based their theories, but the content of the term was undergoing constant change during that period. It had formed the foundation of the rationalist approach, but throughout the century it became increasingly identified with the feelings. A recent book has been devoted wholly to a study of the development of this concept during this period, and ample testimony is brought to bear upon the point. As its author says:

Nature may be conceived rationally or emotionally. Indeed the history of the idea in the eighteenth century can be described in the most general terms as its development from a rational into an emotional principle. Nature and Reason are normally associated in the earlier part of the century, Nature and Feeling in the later.<sup>1</sup>

Welsted in his *The State of Poetry*, 1724, had already put the extreme position when he declared that criticism is ineffective, if not, strictly speaking, impossible, since poetry appeals to and is the product of the feelings. Poetry, according to him, defies all rational analysis, or resolution into principles. 'The truth is', he writes, that

they [i.e., works of criticism] touch only the Externals or Form of the Thing, without entering into the Spirit of it; they play about the Surface of Poetry, but never dive into its Depths; the Secret, the Soul of good Writing is not to be come at thro' such mechanic Laws; the main Graces, and the cardinal Beauties of this Charming Art, lie too retir'd within the Bosom of Nature, and are of too fine and subtle an Essence, to fall under the Discussion of Pedants, Commentators, or trading Criticks, whether they be heavy Prose-drudges, or more sprightly Essayers in Rhime: these Beauties, in a Word, are rather to be felt, than describ'd. . . .<sup>2</sup>

He does not like the conclusions forced upon him, that poetry is not governed by principles of reason, and he tries to evade the difficulty by the usual reference to taste.

Thus Poetry is not an irrational Art, but as closely link'd with Reason, exerted in a right Way, as any other Knowledge; what it differs in, as a Science of Reason, from other Sciences, is, that it does not equally with them, lie level to all Capacities, that a Man, rightly to perceive the Reason and the Truth of it, must be born with *Taste*, or a Faculty of Judging.<sup>3</sup>

Cooper elaborates the views of Hutcheson on taste, and in the list of contents to his *Letters Concerning Taste* declares that

Taste precedes the slower faculties of the Reason, and those of Imagination, but is never repugnant to the former.

<sup>1</sup> Basil Willey, *The Eighteenth Century Background*, 1940, p. 207. While certain qualifications might be made, as a general statement it summarizes accurately the development of the concept.

<sup>2</sup> *Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century*, ed. Durham, p. 365.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 368.

A good TASTE is that instantaneous Glow of Pleasure which thrills thro' our whole Frame, and seizes upon the Applause of the Heart, before the intellectual Power, Reason, can descend from the Throne of the Mind to ratify it's Approbation, either when we receive into the Soul beautiful Images thro' the Organs of bodily Senses; or the Decorum of an amiable Character thro' the Faculties of moral Perception. . . . A rural Prospect upon the very first Glance yields a grateful Emotion in the Breast.<sup>1</sup>

About the precise nature of taste Cooper is rather vague. Although he does not say that taste is definitely irrational, yet the above quotation would seem to indicate that it has a certain degree of independence. He is unwilling to commit himself, however, and in Letter V resolves it into a synthesis of all the mental attributes of man.

For Taste does not *wholly* depend upon the natural Strength and acquir'd Improvement of the *Intellectual* Powers; nor wholly upon a fine Construction of the *Organs* of the Body; nor *wholly* upon the intermediate Powers of the *Imagination*; but upon a Union of these all happily blended, without too great a Prevalency in either.

And yet in the same Letter he seems to emphasize its irrational nature even more by distinguishing taste from the capacity to criticize. The inference would seem to be that criticism is a rational activity, while taste is merely a matter of feeling. Mr. Addison, we are told, in a statement, that if too strongly worded, has a hint of truth in it;

was no *great* Scholar; he was a very indifferent Critic, and a worse Poet; yet . . . he was bless'd with a Taste truly delicate and refin'd.

As the century wore on the concept of taste came more and more to be identified with the feelings. This does not mean that criticism became based entirely on the feelings, for many critics now decided that taste was not so much the faculty that makes the aesthetic judgement, as one, among others, of the elements of the mind that was to be satisfied before we can enjoy aesthetic pleasure. The operation of taste, in fact, as in the quotation from Cooper above, is not identical with the act of criticizing. Lord Kames, for instance, in placing reason and taste in antithesis is careful to point out that taste is only one of the factors to be regarded in criticism.

I carry my views no farther than to the elements of criticism, in order to show, that the fine arts are a subject of reasoning as well as of taste.<sup>2</sup>

Blair in his *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* adopts the same position. The reason, according to him, explains why our aesthetic sense approves or disapproves; it sees the relation of parts to a whole, and the end for which the artist is working. Taste, on the other hand, is independent of, although it receives its training and discipline from, the reason. Criticism combines the rational judgement and the intuitive appreciation of taste.

But however much writers of the period endeavoured to safeguard criti-

<sup>1</sup> Letter I.

<sup>2</sup> Henry Home, *Elements of Criticism*, 1762, I, p. 241.

cism from the arbitrary likes and dislikes of a taste based on the feelings, the growing influence of emotionalism entered into the work of even the stoutest champions of rationalism. Dr. Johnson, who is not usually regarded as a believer in emotionalism, and who is generally cited as an upholder of rational principles in criticism, when he speaks of taste, declares that it is not so much a matter of argument as of personal preference. In discussing Congreve's apology for the failure of *The Double Dealer*, he writes:

These apologies are always useless, '*de gustibus non est disputandum*'; men may be convinced, but they cannot be pleased against their will. But though taste is obstinate it is very variable, and time often prevails when arguments have failed.<sup>1</sup>

He would seem, too, to prefer the spontaneous and perhaps irrational verdict of ordinary people to the informed judgement of the expert. Literature, he would seem to imply, is a matter of the heart and must be judged by the heart.

. . . the common voice of the multitude uninstructed by precept, and unprejudiced by authority, which, in questions that relate to the heart of man, is, in my opinion, more decisive than the learning of Lipsius.<sup>2</sup>

Burke, who gives a very balanced account, in one or two places in his *Essay on the Sublime and the Beautiful*, reflects the contemporary regard for the feelings and individual sensibility.

A rectitude of judgment in the arts, which may be called a good taste, does in a great measure depend upon sensibility; because, if the mind has no bent to the pleasures of the imagination, it will never apply itself sufficiently to works of that species to acquire a competent knowledge in them.<sup>3</sup>

And perhaps even more in the line of development we have been tracing:

it is not by the force of long attention and inquiry that we find any object to be beautiful, beauty demands no assistance from our reasoning; even the will is unconcerned; the appearance of beauty as effectually causes some degree of love in us as the application of ice or fire produces the idea of heat or cold.<sup>4</sup>

The relativity of the standard of taste was increased still further by the growth of the historical method in criticism. Those critics at the end of the seventeenth century who had emphasized taste had also popularized the belief that literature is the product of economic, social, climatic and other forces. In the Ancients and Moderns dispute critics on both sides had brought forward arguments based upon the view that changes of external circumstance had affected literature for better or worse. Temple, Wotton, Dryden and others expressed the view that there is an evolu-

<sup>1</sup> *Lives of the English Poets*, ed. G. B. Hill, Oxford, 1905, II, p. 217.

<sup>2</sup> *The Rambler*, No. 52.

<sup>3</sup> Burke, *Essay on the Sublime and Beautiful*, 1756, ed. Henry Morley, 1905, pp. 31-2.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 99.

tionary process in literature which, although it cannot be described in exact scientific terms, nevertheless, gives rise to change and development. The outcome of this kind of teaching is seen in criticism in the emergence of the historical method.

One of the best-known examples of it is Thomas Blackwell's *An Enquiry into the Life and Writings of Homer*, 1735, where the view is advanced that poetry along with other kinds of writing 'depends upon the *Manners* of a Nation'. The manners of an age, too, according to Blackwell, are reflected, not only in its literature, but in its language, which fluctuates with the growth and decay of morality.

Whoever reflects upon the Rise and Fall of States, will find, that along with their *Manners*, their *Language* too accompanies them both in their Growth and Decay.<sup>1</sup>

Pope, who reflects many of the tendencies of the early School of Taste, extends Boileau's advice on those qualities needful to the true critic to include a knowledge of, and interest in, historical research.

You then whose judgment the right course would steer,  
Know well each ancient's proper character;  
His fable, subject, scope in ev'ry page;  
Religion, country, genius of his age;  
Without all these at once before your eyes,  
Cavil you may, but never criticise.<sup>2</sup>

But the first critical work really to found its method on the historical outlook was Thomas Warton's *Observations on the Faerie Queene of Spenser*. Warton's account of the *Faerie Queene* was an attempt to evaluate the poem in relation to its historical milieu, and the experience he thus accumulated proved invaluable when he came to write his *History of English Poetry*. In a letter which he wrote to Warton upon receipt of a copy of the *Observations*, Johnson approves and declares his intention of giving practical help to this method of research. 'You have shewn to all', he writes to Warton,

who shall hereafter attempt the study of our ancient authours, the way to success; by directing them to the perusal of the books which those authours had read. Of this method, Hughes and men much greater than Hughes, seem never to have thought. The reason why the authours, which are yet read, of the sixteenth century, are so little understood, is that they are read alone; and no help is borrowed from those who lived with them, or before them. Some part of this ignorance I hope to remove by my book [*i.e.* the *Dictionary*].<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Enquiry*, 1735, p. 36.

<sup>2</sup> *Essay on Criticism*, II. 118-23. We know that Pope had thought of writing a history of English poetry. Gray was another poet who also drew up a plan of such a history, based on the scheme of Pope.

<sup>3</sup> Boswell's *Life*, ed. G. B. Hill, Oxford, 1887, I, p. 270. The letter was written in 1754, the year in which Warton's *Observations* were published.

Joseph Warton, who shared most of his brother's critical outlook and opinions, used the same approach when he wrote the *Essay on the Writings and Genius of Pope* (1756).

We can never completely relish, or adequately understand any author, especially any Ancient, except we constantly keep in our eye, his climate, his country and his age.<sup>1</sup>

There is no need to trace the growth of the historical method of criticism farther. By the last quarter of the century it had become firmly established. It is only necessary to note that it was inspired and strengthened by the antiquarian research that had continued since the end of the previous century, and that this research was started, in some cases, by the same writers who had popularized the concept of taste in criticism at that time. The growth of the historical method, in fact, is part of that whole liberalizing movement in criticism, of which the concept of taste was one of the main factors.

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 5, 1761 edn.

## ISAAC WATTS AND WILLIAM BLAKE

By V. DE S. PINTO

Several critics<sup>1</sup> have noticed that Blake's *Songs of Innocence and Experience* were influenced by Dr. Isaac Watts's *Divine Songs attempted in Easy Language for the use of Children*, but the relationship between the work of the two authors has never been explored in detail. The following notes are suggestions which may serve as a starting point for such an exploration.

Isaac Watts, the celebrated nonconformist divine, poet, and educationist of the early eighteenth century, was a man who stood between two worlds. As an Independent preacher, he was the inheritor of the old Calvinist tradition of rigid morality and bibliolatry. Yet he was also a humanist of the reign of Queen Anne with a classical education and a philosophic training, a student of Descartes and Locke, of Milton, Pope, and Addison. His whole career is built on a compromise between the old Puritanism of the age of Cromwell and the new humanism of the age of Addison.

William Blake, the poor, self-educated London engraver, also belongs to the Puritan tradition. His family was nonconformist, but Puritanism had by now undergone a remarkable change. The old legalistic Calvinism was in a much more advanced state of decay than in Watts's time, and the rigid morality, already softening in Queen Anne's reign, was now in full retreat before the armies of free thought and revolutionary speculation. Blake was an open rebel, where Watts was only a mild critic, and many passages in Blake's works show that the compromise which Watts suavely maintained throughout his life has now been flung to the winds.

I went to the Garden of Love,  
And saw what I never had seen:  
A Chapel was built in the midst,  
Where I used to play on the green.  
And the gates of this Chapel were shut,  
And 'Thou shall not' writ over the door;  
So I turn'd to the Garden of Love;  
That so many sweet flowers bore;  
And I saw it was filled with graves  
And tomb-stones where flowers should be;  
And Priests in black gowns were walking their rounds,  
And binding with briars my joys & desires.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See S. Foster Damon, *William Blake his Philosophy and Symbols*, p. 41; Mona Wilson, *The Life of William Blake*, p. 38; A. P. Davis, *Isaac Watts his Life and Works* (New York, 1943), p. 228.

<sup>2</sup> Blake, *Poetry and Prose*, ed. Keynes (Nonesuch), p. 75.

The revolt against traditional Puritan morality is very clearly symbolized in these lines. We can contrast them with numerous passages in Watts's writings which express the traditional Puritan condemnation of sensuality :

It is the great business of sinners to fulfil the lusts of the flesh, and make provision for it. The things that relate to the flesh, and the enjoyments of this sensible and present life, are the objects of sinful appetites, or of lawful appetite in a sinful degree and therefore sin is called flesh. Sin is also called flesh because it is communicated and propagated to us by the parents of our flesh. It is by our flesh that we are akin to Adam, the first great sinner, and derive a corrupted nature from him.<sup>1</sup>

What was sin for Watts has become the 'garden of love' for Blake ; and 'Thou shalt not', which for Watts was the injunction of a beneficent creator, in Blake's poem is the command of a tyrant.

Yet in spite of this apparent contrast, which might be illustrated by many passages from the works of the two writers, there are striking resemblances between some of their most characteristic doctrines and beliefs. Both believe in poetic inspiration and prefer Hebrew to Graeco-Roman poetry ;<sup>2</sup> both condemn 'Natural Religion and Deism'. Both believe in a God of forgiveness as opposed to a God of wrath.

Watts sometimes speaks almost in the very accents of Blake, especially when he is dealing with such subjects as inspiration and faith, and contrasting them with rationality and intellect :

Learning and wit may cease their strife  
When miracles with glory shine ;  
The voice that calls the dead to life,  
Must be almighty and divine.

\* \* \* \* \*

Let Heathens scoff and Jews oppose  
Let Satan's bolts be hurl'd ;  
There's something wrought within you shews  
That Jesus saves the world.<sup>3</sup>

Blake may well have had these lines in mind when he wrote his famous protests against rationalism and its child, imperialism :

Mock on, Mock on Voltaire, Rousseau :  
Mock on, Mock on : 'tis all in vain !  
You throw the sand against the wind,  
And the wind blows back it again.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Isaac Watts, Sermon IV, *Works* (1812) I, 46.

<sup>2</sup> See Watts, Preface to *Horae Lyricae* (1709) *ed. cit.* IX, 222 : 'The Gentiles talk and trifle upon this subject, when brought into comparison with Moses, whom Longinus . . . cites as a master of the sublime style'. Cf. Blake, Preface to *Milton* : 'The Stolen & Perverted writings of Homer & Ovid . . . are set up by artifice against the Sublime of the Bible'.

<sup>3</sup> Watts, *ed. cit.*, I, 44.

<sup>4</sup> Blake, *ed. cit.*, p. 107.

Titus! Constantine! Charlemaine!  
 O Voltaire! Rousseau! Gibbon! Vain  
 Your Grecian Mocks & Roman Sword  
 Against this image of his Lord!<sup>1</sup>

One of the earliest reviews of Blake's poetry (in the *Monthly Review* for October, 1806) compares him with Watts as a poet of childhood, and, among later critics, Foster Damon and Mona Wilson have both made passing allusions to Blake's debt to Watts in the *Songs of Innocence* and *Experience*. Watts's *Divine Songs for Children* was one of the most popular books of the eighteenth century. As Mr. A. P. Davis has shown in his recent study of Watts,<sup>2</sup> it is the inheritor of the tradition of the numerous Puritan 'good godly books' for children published in the seventeenth century, but Watts's collection gave an entirely new tone to the poetry of childhood. Though much of it seems to us now merely versified moralizing, there is a lyrical charm in the best of Watts's child poems, which was quite unknown to the old Puritan versifiers. Moreover, Watts was a forward-looking poet. In the short preface to the 'Slight Specimen of Moral Songs' which he appends to the *Divine Songs* he writes that they are 'such as I wish some happy and condescending Genius would undertake for the use of children, and perform much better'.

Mr. Robert Graves once gave a specimen of what he called 'a formal version logicalized in creaking sonnet form' of Blake's 'Infant Joy':

But thou, Blest Infant, smiling radiantly  
 Hast taught me . . .<sup>3</sup>

He suggests also that 'an immoral but far more entertaining parlour game than logicalization . . . would be to extract the essentials from some long-winded but sincere Augustan poem, disguise the self-conscious antitheses, modernize the diction, liven up the rhythm, fake a personal twist, and publish'. Mr. Graves was not apparently aware of the fact that Blake himself (perhaps unconsciously) did something very much like what he suggested as a parlour game for a modern poet. Watts's masterpiece of child poetry, the famous 'Cradle Hymn', which stands at the end of his *Moral Songs*, is a very good Augustan poem (hardly long-winded, certainly sincere, and not, perhaps, free from self-conscious antithesis). Blake's 'Cradle Song' in the *Songs of Innocence* might be described as a 'delogicalization' of Watts's poem, to which Blake has given a rhythm akin to, yet differing from, that of the original, and a very distinct 'personal twist'. It is instructive to place the two poems side by side.

<sup>1</sup> Blake, *ed. cit.*, p. 649.

<sup>2</sup> A. P. Davis, *op. cit.*, Ch. IV.

<sup>3</sup> Robert Graves, *On English Poetry* (1922), pp. 67, 68.

*A Cradle Hymn*<sup>1</sup> (Isaac Watts)

Hush! my dear, lie still and slumber;  
Holy angels guard thy bed!  
Heavenly blessings without number  
Gently falling on thy head.

<sup>2</sup>  
Sleep, my babe; thy food and raiment,  
House and home thy friends provide,  
All without thy care or payment,  
All thy wants are well supply'd.

<sup>3</sup>  
How much better thou'rt attended  
Than the Son of God could be,  
When from heaven he descended  
And became a child like thee.

<sup>4</sup>  
Soft and easy is thy cradle;  
Coarse and hard thy Saviour lay;  
When his birthplace was a stable,  
And his softest bed was hay,

<sup>5</sup>  
Blessed babe! what glorious features,  
Spotless fair, divinely bright!  
Must he dwell with brutal creatures?  
How could angels bear the sight?

<sup>6</sup>  
Was there nothing but a manger  
Cursed sinners could afford,  
To receive the heav'nly stranger?  
Did they thus affront their Lord?

<sup>7</sup>  
Soft, my child; I did not chide thee,  
Tho' my song might sound too hard:  
Tis thy mother sits besides thee,  
And her arm shall be thy guard.

<sup>8</sup>  
Yet to read the shameful story,  
How the Jews abused their King,  
How they serv'd the Lord of glory,  
Makes me angry while I sing.

<sup>9</sup>  
See the kinder shepherds round him  
Telling wonders from the sky:  
There they sought him, there they found  
him,  
With his virgin Mother by.

<sup>10</sup>  
See the lovely Babe a dressing:  
Lovely Infant, how he smil'd!  
When he wept the Mother's blessing  
Sooth'd and hush'd the holy Child.

<sup>11</sup>  
Lo, he slumbers in his manger,  
Where the horned oxen feed;  
Peace, my darling, here's no danger,  
Here's no ox anear thy bed.

*A Cradle Song*<sup>2</sup> (William Blake)

Sweet dreams, form a shade  
O'er my lovely infant's head;  
Sweet dreams of pleasant streams  
By happy, silent, moony beams.

<sup>2</sup>  
Sweet sleep, with soft down  
Weave thy brows an infant crown,  
Sweet sleep, Angel mild!  
Hover o'er my happy child.

<sup>3</sup>  
Sweet smiles, in the night  
Hover over my delight;  
Sweet smiles, Mother's smiles,  
All the livelong night beguiles.

<sup>4</sup>  
Sweet moans, dovelike sighs,  
Chase not slumber from thy eyes.  
Sweet moans, sweeter smiles,  
All the dovelike moans beguiles.

<sup>5</sup>  
Sleep, sleep, happy child,  
All creation slept and smil'd;  
Sleep, sleep, happy sleep,  
While o'er thee thy mother weep.

<sup>6</sup>  
Sweet babe in thy face,  
Holy image I can trace.  
Sweet babe, once like thee,  
Thy maker lay and wept for me,

<sup>7</sup>  
Wept for me, for thee, for all,  
When he was an infant small.  
Thou his image ever see,  
Heavenly face that smiles on thee,

<sup>8</sup>  
Smiles on thee, on me, on all;  
Who became an infant small.  
Infant smiles are his own smiles;  
Heaven & earth to peace beguiles.

<sup>1</sup> Isaac Watts, *ed. cit.*, IX, 216.

<sup>2</sup> Blake, *ed. cit.*, pp. 61, 62.

12

'Twas to save thee, child, from dying,  
Save my dear from burning flame,  
Bitter groans, and endless crying,  
That thy blest Redeemer came.

13

May'st thou live to know and fear him,  
Trust and love him all thy days!  
Then go dwell for ever near him,  
See his face and sing his praise!

14

I could give thee thousand kisses,  
Hoping what I most desire;  
Not a mother's fondest wishes,  
Can to greater joys aspire.

The general schemes of the two poems are very similar. Both begin with the lulling of the child to sleep and the calling down of 'blessings' (Watts) or 'sweet dreams' (Blake) on its head. 'Head' in this connection is a rime word in both opening stanzas. Angels are called upon to guard Watts's child and the Angel Sleep to hover over Blake's. In both poems the human child is compared with the Christ-child. In stanza 3 of Watts's poem Christ is said to become 'a child *like thee*' and in stanza 6 of Blake's poem we find a line ending with the same words: 'Sweet babe, once *like thee*'. The words 'infant' and 'smile' (smiles—smil'd) are used in connection with the Christ-child in stanza 7 of Blake's poem and in stanza 10 of Watts's. In stanza 13 of Watts's poem the human child is exhorted to see the face of Christ and in stanza 7 of Blake's almost the same words are used.

The differences between the poems are as interesting as the resemblances. Watts's poem is classical in its clarity, its logical development and its sharp outlines. The comparison between the human child and the Christ-child is emphasized by means of a series of antitheses. These are followed by the rhetorical questions which bring out the contrast between the glory of Christ and the meanness of his reception on earth, with an effective pause in the declamation to reassure the human child. The allusion to the coming tragedy of the crucifixion leads up to the detailed description of the Christ-child in the traditional surroundings visualized as clearly as in a painting of the Italian renaissance. Blake uses the same material, but eliminates all the rhetoric and all the description. He has translated Watts's poem, as it were, into a new poetic idiom.

Both poems are in four-accent lines with a falling ('trochaic') rhythm arranged in four-line stanzas—Watts's lines rime alternately, Blake's in couplets. Watts's rhythm (helped by his double rimes) is bold and flowing, Blake's is much subtler, a sort of croon, swaying, as it were, gently to and fro like a cradle. This effect is achieved by the frequent and

masterly use of monosyllabic feet in place of the complete falling foot or 'trochee':

Sweet dreams, form a shade. . . .

Sweet dreams of pleasant streams.

Watts's characteristic device is antithesis, Blake's repetition. Watts's poem appeals to the intellect and the visual imagination; Blake's is a sort of incantation, where the emotive value of words is the chief consideration, to which even grammar is sacrificed (as in stanzas 3 and 4). In Watts's poem the divine child is quite separate from the human child, and is, indeed, contrasted with him. His surroundings (the shepherds, the manger, and the horned oxen) are described, and his death is foretold. In the twelfth stanza there is even a statement of orthodox dogma. All these details disappear in Blake's poems. The divine child is partly blended with the human child; he is a 'holy image', which the poet can see in the baby's face. His sufferings are only mentioned in a few words, and he is conceived as a 'heavenly face' which in some mysterious way the human child sees smiling, and which is identified with the smiling face of all human children.

The flower poem, the animal or bird poem, and the insect poem are all traditional features of collections of children's poetry in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and were derived, doubtless, from the old Emblem books. All these types are found both in Watts and Blake, as well as in earlier collections such as Bunyan's *Book for Boys and Girls*. It is interesting to examine the treatment of the insect theme in poems by Bunyan, Watts and Blake respectively. Bunyan, basing his poem on *Proverbs*, VI, 6-8, regards the insect simply as an object lesson in the Puritan virtues of thrift and prudence:

Must we unto the pismire go to school,  
To learn of her in summer to provide  
For winter next ensuing. Man's a fool,  
Or silly ants would not be made his guide.  
But, sluggard, is it not a shame for thee  
To be outdone by pismires?<sup>1</sup>

Watts also uses the ant as a text for a versified sermon, but, unlike Bunyan, he takes some interest in the insects for their own sake; in the first three lines of his poem he expresses the imaginative appeal of their smallness and helplessness.

These Emmets, how little they seem in our eyes!  
We tread them to dust, and a troop of them dies,  
Without our regard or concern: . . .<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Bunyan, *A Book for Boys and Girls*, No. XXIII, *Collected Works*, ed. Offor (1867), III, p. 758.

<sup>2</sup> Watts, *ed. cit.*, IX, p. 215.

The rest of the poem is mere moralizing, but the opening lines suggest an entirely new way of treating the subject. Blake took his cue from Watts. His poem 'The Dream'<sup>1</sup> is a vision of the smallness and helplessness of the insect world. The moralizing has entirely disappeared.

Once a dream did weave a shade  
O'er my Angel-guarded bed,  
That an Emmet lost its way  
Where on grass methought I lay.

Troubled, 'wilder'd and forlorn,  
Dark, benighted, travel-worn,  
Over many a tangled spray,  
All heart-broke I heard her say:

"O my children! do they cry?  
Do they hear their father sigh?  
Now they look abroad to see;  
Now return to weep for me".

Bunyan writes about a single pismire, but his insect is only an abstraction standing for Puritan virtue. Watts can only think of his emmets in the mass, but he can appreciate the poetic value of their smallness, as well as their convenience as object lessons for the moralist. Blake, like Bunyan, deals with a single emmet, but for him the insect is not an allegory of thrift or prudence at all, but an image of smallness, loneliness and bewilderment. Perhaps a comparison between the three poems has a wider significance. They represent three different stages in the approach of adults to the world of childhood (for the insect is the symbol of the child). In Bunyan we see the adult interested only in forcing the child into the mould of a traditional morality. Watts also holds this view, as it were officially, but he has a secret sympathy for the child as a child, and feels the charm and beauty of the small and the helpless. Blake no longer thinks of turning the child into a model of adult virtue, but tries to enter with imaginative sympathy into the child-world of smallness, helplessness and bewilderment.

Some of Blake's *Songs of Experience* seem like direct answers to Watts's *Divine Songs*. For instance, No. XXIII of Watts's collection is a sort of versified gloss on the fifth commandment. 'Children that would fear the Lord' are told to listen to their teachers and obey their parents 'with reverence and delight'. Dreadful things are threatened

To him that breaks his father's law,  
Or mocks his mother's word.

'Heavy guilt' is said to lie upon him. His name is to be cursed. Ravens are

<sup>1</sup> Blake, *ed. cit.*, p. 52.

to pick out his eyes, 'and eagles eat the same'. Blake's 'A Little Boy Lost' in *Songs of Experience* is surely intended as a reply to this fierce Old Testament morality. In the two opening quatrains Blake seems to be trying to express the sort of reasoning with which a child might be made to answer such precepts as these of Watts:

Nought loves another as itself,  
Nor venerates another so,  
Nor is it possible to Thought  
A greater than itself to know:

And Father, how can I love you  
Or any of my brothers more?  
I love you like the little bird  
That picks up crumbs around the door.

Blake imagines a 'priest' overhearing these words, seizing the child by the hair, stripping him to his 'little shirt', and binding him with an iron chain. Then they

burn'd him in a holy place,  
Where many had been burn'd before: . . .

Surely this 'holy place' is the place where Watts's ravens and eagles peck out the dead child's eyes. Both poems are symbols of the killing of the child-mind by the spirit of Puritan morality. Watts, with all his sensibility, regards the sacrifice as part of the divine plan; for Blake it is a murder, which evokes the horrified question: 'Are such things done on Albion's shore?'<sup>1</sup>

Both Watts and Blake were concerned with the relationship of the child to poverty. Blake's famous poem 'London' in the *Songs of Experience* is, I believe, connected with Song IV of Watts's collection. If the poems are placed side by side, it will be seen that the relationship between them is not unlike that between 'A Cradle Hymn' and 'A Cradle Song'. There are indeed no close verbal resemblances between these poems, and nothing could be more unlike the smugness of Watts's poem than the tragic intensity of Blake's, but the sequence of ideas in the two poems is the same. Both begin with a walk through the town. In both, the vision of poverty and misery follows, and in both the vision is completed by a picture of the foul-mouthed children of eighteenth-century London. Again Blake is more succinct than Watts. He suppresses the moralizing of Watts's child and the rhetorical antitheses, and in place of Watts's vague generalizations, gives us the terribly distinct images of the child chimney sweep, the 'black'ning church', the 'youthful harlot' and the 'marriage hearse'.

<sup>1</sup> Blake, *ed. cit.*, p. 78.

Isaac Watts. Song IV  
(*Divine Songs for Children*)

Whene'er I take my walks abroad,  
How many poor I see,  
What shall I render to my God  
For all his gifts to me?

Not more than others I deserve,  
Yet God hath given me more;  
For I have food while others starve,  
Or beg from door to door.

How many children in the street  
Half naked I behold!  
While I am clothed from head to feet,  
And covered from the cold.

While some poor wretches scarce can tell  
Where they may lay their head:  
I have a home wherein to dwell,  
And rest upon my bed.

While others early learn to swear,  
And curse and lye, and steal;  
Lord, I am taught thy name to fear,  
And do thy holy will.

Are these thy favours, day by day  
To me above the rest?  
Then let me love thee more than they,  
And try to serve thee best.

William Blake. 'London'  
(*Songs of Experience*)

I wander thro' each charter'd street,  
Near where the charter'd Thames does  
flow,  
And mark in every face I meet  
Marks of weakness, marks of woe.

In every cry of every Man,  
In every Infants cry of fear,  
In every voice, in every ban,  
The mind-forg'd manacles I hear.

How the Chimney-sweeper's cry  
Every black'ning Church appalls;  
And the hopeless Soldier's sigh  
Runs in blood down Palace walls.

But most thro' midnight streets I hear  
How the youthful Harlot's curse  
Blasts the new-born Infants tear,  
And blights with plagues the Marriage  
hearse.

Blake's two Holy Thursday poems were apparently suggested by a Charity School service at St. Paul's. Watts published an *Essay on Charity Schools* in 1723; and the similarity of a passage in this Essay to the second Holy Thursday poem suggests to me that Blake had read it. Watts's *Essay* exhibits a characteristic dualism of thought. On the one hand he feels a generous sympathy with the poor child and a desire to give it education. On the other hand he is a firm supporter of the social structure of contemporary England, and entirely agrees with such writers as Bishop Edmund Gibson, who contended that Charity Schools ought not to teach such 'polite' subjects as Latin, Greek, modern languages and mathematics, which were only suitable for young ladies and gentlemen.<sup>1</sup> To those critics of Charity Schools who argued that poor children ought to be brought up to be servants and that education would make them 'high, haughty and wasteful', Watts replies that the sort of education that Charity Schools gave would make them more useful as servants and at the same time better Christians. This is his main argument, but it is qualified in several places by the writer's liberal and humane spirit. He puts in a plea for the 'lad of bright genius' who may be found here and there among the poor.

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Watts, *ed. cit.*, VI, 28.

'Diamonds of a noble lustre are taken from common earth, and every diamond is rough or cloudy, till it is polished. If there is a vein of silver mixed with the leaden ore, why should it be denied the favour of the refining-pot, since nature seems to have made it on purpose to shine and glitter?'<sup>1</sup>

There is a glow of generous indignation in the passage in which Watts dwells on the unhappy condition of children of parents who have lost their money and who, after enjoying wealth and ease, are reduced to the humiliations of poverty. I believe that Blake had this passage in mind when he wrote the second Holy Thursday poem in *Songs of Experience*.

## Isaac Watts

'An Essay on Charity Schools (1723)'<sup>2</sup>

Yet surely there may be some exceptions made for the children of those poor parents, who have enjoyed plentiful circumstances in life, and have behaved well in them, and performed the duties of justice and charity; but by the wise providence of God have been reduced to great degrees of poverty, and are hardly able to provide food and clothing for their own offspring, and much less to bestow a good education upon them. Some of these children are yet sunk deeper into distress, and are become orphans. Such misery has somewhat of a sacred tenderness belonging to it, and seems to claim the regards of sympathy and compassion from those who enjoy plentiful circumstances, while they meditate on the uncertainty of human affairs, and remember they are liable to the like calamity.

It can hardly be an accident that the key words 'reduced' and 'poverty' occur both in the prose passage and in the poem. The last sentence of the prose passage may be connected with the last line of Blake's first 'Holy Thursday' poem in the *Songs of Innocence*: 'Then cherish pity, lest you drive an angel from your door'.

A study of the relationship between the writings of Watts and Blake, towards which some hints may be found in this essay, is not merely an exploration of literary sources. It throws light on an important phase of the development both of poetic sensibility and of the social conscience.

William Blake. 'Holy Thursday'<sup>3</sup>

Is this a holy thing to see  
In a rich and fruitful land,  
Babes reduc'd to misery,  
Fed with cold and usurous hand?

Is that trembling cry a song?  
Can it be a song of joy?  
And so many children poor?  
It is a land of poverty!

And their sun does never shine,  
And their fields are bleak & bare,  
And their ways are fill'd with thorns:  
It is eternal winter there.

For wher-e'er the sun does shine,  
And wher-e'er the rain does fall  
Babe can never hunger there,  
Nor poverty the mind appall.

<sup>1</sup> Watts, *An Essay on Charity Schools*, ed. cit., VI, p. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Watts, *ibid.*, p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Blake, *ed. cit.*, pp. 70, 71.

## NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

### NOTES ON DONNE

#### I

#### The 'two reverend men' of Donne's Fourth Satire

Commentators have hitherto failed to identify the 'two reverend men of our two Academies' whom Donne in his Fourth Satire named with Beza and some Jesuits as the best linguists, in answer to the bore who refused to accept his first jesting answer of 'Calepines Dictionarie'. The Dobell MS., now in Harvard College Library (Nor. 4506), offers an explanation. My friend Professor R. E. Bennett, who has collated this section of the manuscript, informs me that a marginal note to Satire IV, l. 56, supplies the names 'D<sup>r</sup> Reinolds and D<sup>r</sup> Andrewes' in the margin. John Reynolds (1549-1607) was Reader in Greek at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, from 1572/3 to 1578. He became Dean of Lincoln in 1593, and President of Corpus Christi College in 1598. Bishop Hall described him as 'full of all faculties, of all studies, of all learning; the memory, the reading of that man were near to a miracle'. 'D<sup>r</sup> Andrewes' must be Lancelot Andrewes, who was Master of Pembroke College, Cambridge, from 1589 to 1605, and subsequently became Bishop of Chichester, Ely, and Winchester in turn.

Sir Herbert Grierson ascribes the Fourth Satire to 1597 on account of the reference in l. 114 to 'the losse of Amyens'. At this date Reynolds and Andrewes might well be described as the leading linguists of Oxford and Cambridge, 'our two Academies' in Donne's phrase. It is worth noting as a piece of corroborative evidence that in *Essays in Divinity* (1651 edition, p. 49) Donne speaks of Reynolds as 'our learnedst Doctor', and refers in the margin to his book *De Romanæ Ecclesiæ Idolatria*.

#### II

'ast ego vicissim . . .'

In my *Study of the Prose Works of John Donne* (p. 284) I printed from the Burley MS. a letter written by Donne to a friend at the beginning of the Islands Voyage in 1597, when the fleet was driven back by a storm to shelter at Plymouth. I had before me only the transcript made by order of the Clarendon Press, for the manuscript had been destroyed by a fire at

Burley-on-the-Hill. This transcript contained the sentence 'how it will end I know not ast ego vicissim Cicero'. I printed this sentence without any attempt at emendation. Mr. John Hayward in his Nonesuch edition *John Donne: Poetry and Prose* (p. 439) printed the latter part of it as 'ast ego vicissim (Cicero)', and added a note on p. 786, 'Cicero is obviously a gloss that has crept into the text'. Professor P. Maas has pointed out to me that the sentence is a quotation from Horace, *Epode* XV. 24: 'ast ego vicissim risero'. Donne means to say 'but it will be my turn to laugh'. The scribe mistook the short Elizabethan 'r' for 'c', and when this initial blunder had been made, the change from 'c' to 'C' and from 's' to 'c' followed naturally.

## III

## Another undescribed manuscript of Donne's poems

While looking through Rawlinson MSS. in the Bodleian Library, my husband recently identified two collections of Donne's poems in a single volume *RP 117*, which was not described by Sir Herbert Grierson in his edition.<sup>1</sup> The first collection, near the beginning of the volume, is a very small one. On f. 26 we have 'Dunne his discription of a storme suffered in the Ilande voyage. 1597 And sent to M<sup>r</sup> X<sup>ro</sup>: Brooke'. This is followed on ff. 27-8 by 'A Caulme described'. On f. 29 there is a poem which is attributed to Donne in some manuscripts and editions, but is here more correctly described as 'M<sup>r</sup> W<sup>m</sup> Bakers paradox in prayse of a paynted face' (Grierson, *Poems of Donne*, Appendix C, vol. i, p. 456). A piece of evidence which suggests that the compiler of the collection had access to members of Donne's circle, is supplied by the appearance on f. 17 of a copy of the verses 'M<sup>r</sup> Tilmā of Pemb: hall in Camb: his resolucion of not enteringe into Orders', which begins 'Stay but may such a motion be w<sup>b</sup>stood'. This poem was evidently the occasion of Donne's poem 'To M<sup>r</sup> Tilman after he had taken orders' (Grierson, i, 351), but it was unknown till in 1931 H. Harvey Wood printed it in an account of a manuscript volume of poems owned by Mr. Glass of Taverham Hall near Norwich (*Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, xvi. 184-6).

If we reverse *RP 117*, we find a fresh foliation, and a second and larger collection of Donne's poems. On f. 32<sup>v</sup> we have 'M<sup>r</sup> Dunne. Change' (Donne's *Elegy* III, ll. 1-16 in Grierson's numbering), followed by a number of pieces by other authors. On f. 55 Donne's *Elegy* XI appears with the heading 'Dunne. To a gentelwoman whose bracelet hauing [*sic*] lost She demands a dozen angels to be turnde into an other', and this is

<sup>1</sup> It was known to Sir E. K. Chambers, who printed from it the doubtful poem 'Love bred of glances' in his Appendix B (*Poems of Donne*, ii. 293) and added on p. 298 the note 'From Rawl. Poet. MS. 117, f. 222'.

followed by Elegy II described as 'The Anagram. Dunne, the old womans prayse', Elegy XIV 'Dunnes tale of a citizen and his wife', Elegy XIX with the heading 'Dunnes sonnets', Elegy IX 'M<sup>r</sup> Dunnes prayse of middle age', Elegy XVI 'To hir offeringe to goe w<sup>th</sup> him as his page', Elegy XII 'His partinge w<sup>h</sup> his M<sup>rs</sup>', Elegy VI without title, but headed 'Dunne', Elegy IV, Elegy XVIII 'Loues Progress', Elegy XX 'Making of men', Elegy VII followed by Elegy VIII without any break or title, Elegy III with the heading 'M<sup>r</sup> Dunne'—a full copy of the elegy 'Change' which had already appeared on f. 32<sup>v</sup> in a truncated form. Interspersed among the Elegies are a number of Donne's *Songs and Sonets*, such as *The Flea*, *The Message*, 'Goe and catch a falling starre', *The Legacy*, *Twickenham Garden*, *Breake of day* (with the stanza 'Stay, O sweet, and do not rise' prefixed to it as in the edition of 1669 and Stowe MS. 961), *The Extasie*, and also the *Epithalamium* 'Haile Bishop Valentine', and 'A Dialogue between S<sup>r</sup> H. Wootton and M<sup>r</sup> Dunne', which was printed with this title in the editions 1635–1669, but which Grierson ascribes to Pembroke and Ruddier (*Poems*, i. 430) on the authority of the Pembroke and Ruddier *Poems* of 1660 and MSS. *H* 39, *H* 40, *P*. A number of poems ascribed by the compiler to other authors occupy ff. 82<sup>v</sup>–93<sup>v</sup>, followed on f. 94 by Donne's Elegy I with 'Jealousie' and 'M<sup>r</sup> Donne' added in another hand.

The text of the elegies presents certain points of interest. Grierson knew of only two manuscripts (*B*, *O'F*) which contained Elegy XIV, and he included it in the canon with some doubts of its authenticity (*Poems*, ii. cxxxviii). It appeared first in the edition of 1635, and its text offered a number of difficulties. The edition of 1669 included a good many variants, apparently derived from a different manuscript from that which was the source of 1635. In this particular case Grierson's text is somewhat eclectic, being based on 1635, but preferring the readings of 1669 in ll. 10, 21, 38, 41, 47, 65, 66, 67, and of the MSS. in ll. 46, 58, 61. Since the two manuscripts have obviously a common source, their testimony is really that of a single manuscript, and in view of the faulty text of 1635 it is clear that the evidence of another manuscript, independent of *B*, *O'F*, is worth consideration. *RP 117* (2) is carelessly written, l. 5 being omitted, for example, but it has some interesting readings, especially one in l. 24. Here 1635 has 'Iland Seas', 1669 and *O'F* 'Midland Seas', *B* 'the land, the seas' with 'mid' inserted above. Grierson (*Poems*, ii. 84) has a long note to show that the sea intended must be the Mediterranean, which is called both 'the Inland Sea' and 'the Midland Sea', but not 'the Island Sea'. He prints 'I<n>land Seas' on the ground that the 1635 reading can be explained as due to the omission of a contraction mark for 'n'. *RP 117* (2) reads 'Inland seas', thus supplying the manuscript evidence which Grierson lacked. Collation shows that this manuscript was not derived from 1635, though

its text is much nearer to 1635 than to 1669, *B, O'F*. In l. 22 it reads 'Ask't howe' for 'Ask'd if', in l. 29 'I vrgde him much to speake' for 'I urged him to speake', in l. 41 'Cald y' the dayes of action' where 1635 has 'Call'd that the age of action', and 1669, *B, O'F*, 'Call'd those the age of action'. In l. 41 it supports 1635 in reading 'quoth I' where the other texts read 'quoth Hee' or 'quoth he'. In l. 64 it supports 1669 in reading 'his gold (his hope)' against 'the gold (his hope)' of 1635, but in l. 65 it agrees with 1635 in reading 'at' against 'at's' of 1669.

This is only a sample of the many variants found in the Elegies. Collation of other poems suggests that *RP 117 (2)* was ultimately derived from the manuscript which was the source of 1635, as opposed to the manuscript which was the ultimate source of 1633 and the manuscripts supporting it. Thus in *The Curse*, where there are two quite different forms, with different rhymes, of the second stanza, *RP 117 (2)* contains the version found in 1635, *A 18, A 25, P, S*, and the *TC* group. Since *RP 117 (2)* is free from a number of the blunders which disfigure 1635, though it introduces others of its own, it may be an important witness to the readings of the archetype.

EVELYN M. SIMPSON.

#### ANDREW LANG AND THE FAIRY TALE

'The *Author* of this book', wrote Lang in his Introduction to *My Own Fairy Book* (1895), 'is also the *Editor* of the *Blue, Red, Green, and Yellow Fairy Books*. He has always felt rather an impostor, because so many children seem to think that he made up these books out of his own head. Now he only picked up a great many old fairy tales, told in French, German, Greek, Chinese, Red Indian, Russian, and other languages, and had them translated and printed, with pictures'.

As Lang's name is popularly associated almost entirely with the Fairy Books that he edited, this reminder is still valuable. The scope of Lang's work in these books is very accurately defined by his own description, even in so far as that he 'had them translated', for in only a very few cases did he retell a story himself. Although editing the stories for children, Lang approached their selection mainly from the point of view of the folklorist; indeed except for the peculiar choice of the *Gulliver's Travels* (Part I) retold by May Kendall for *The Blue Fairy Book* (1889), the only story that is not in the main traditional is Southey's *The Three Bears* (*The Green Fairy Book*, 1892). Otherwise there are no tales with a more literary overlay than those of Madame d'Aulnoy and Hans Andersen. One Greek

story, retold by Lang himself, is restored to the status of a folk-tale by the suppression of all names personal and local.<sup>1</sup>

In his earlier years he was confessedly biased towards the folklorist's outlook with regard to traditional tales—'There was a time when I regarded all *contes*, except *contes populaires*, as frivolous and vexatious'.<sup>2</sup> This is still his attitude when in reviewing Mrs. Ewing's *Jan of the Windmill* he praises her in that she never 'burlesques things old' as do other writers for children.<sup>3</sup> Yet twenty years later this attitude has so changed that he can praise Thackeray for his treatment of the fairy tale, in that he 'burlesques it with a kindly mockery'.<sup>4</sup>

Lang held that the true fairies were the fairies of the North, and the true fairy-tales the *Märchen* of the Grimms, Dasent and Campbell, yet in his earliest original fairy story, *The Princess Nobody* (1884), he is content to follow very much in the stereotyped tradition of sophisticated fancy, of winged fairies sporting amongst flowers and beneath toadstools; this is, however, mainly accounted for by the peculiar circumstances under which the story was written: to fit in with Richard Doyle's pictures which had originally illustrated Allingham's poems, *In Fairyland* (1869).

It is to his second fairy story that we must turn to find Lang at his best, and at his most original and genuine. In this, *The Gold of Fairnilee* (1888), he breaks away from every literary tradition from Shakespeare downwards, away even from the genuine folk-tale of Grimm or Dasent, and returns to the gloomy horrors of the Scottish Fairyland, going direct to the ballads of 'Tamlane' and 'Thomas the Rhymer' for his machinery. His fairies are the dark, subterranean people of Northern superstition, the tributaries of the Devil who pay a 'tiend to Hell' of a human captive (preferably an unbaptized babe), the 'Orphan heirs of fixed destiny'. 'These', says Lang, 'are the true fairies, the shadows of the ancient dead, of the old Classic gods, unredeemed, who dwell in their own allotted half-world of reflected light and double shadow, the court of Queen Proserpina'.<sup>5</sup> 'These mysterious beings, who borrow Christian knights, who pay a tax to Hell, who steal children and employ mortal nurses, who carry men away from the edge of the flooded ford, have no connection but in name with Madame d'Aulnoy's capricious *fées*, who are propitiated with gifts of ribbons, scissors and candy'.<sup>6</sup>

*The Gold of Fairnilee* is one of the most sincere of Lang's works: he was by nature a romantic, though very seldom in all the large mass of his

<sup>1</sup> 'The Terrible Head' (i.e. Perseus and Medusa), *The Blue Fairy Book*, 1889, pp. 182-92.

<sup>2</sup> 'Literary Fairy Stories' (Lang's Introduction to F. Van Eeden's *Little Johannes*), 1895.

<sup>3</sup> *Academy*, 15 July 1876.

<sup>4</sup> 'Literary Fairy Stories', *op. cit.*

<sup>5</sup> 'Comedies of Shakespeare', *Harper's Magazine*, December 1889.

<sup>6</sup> 'Modern Fairy Tales', *Illustrated London News*, 3 December 1892.

writings are his truer and deeper feelings allowed to find expression. 'He was fastidiously correct and reserved', writes Sidney Colvin, 'on his guard, even to affectation, against any show of emotion, and constantly dissembling the *perfervidum ingenium* of his race, if he had it, under a cloak of indifference and light banter';<sup>1</sup> and his closest friend, Rider Haggard, understood him even better. 'The truth is', he says, 'that his laughter is often enough of the sort that is summoned to the lips to hide tears in the eyes'.<sup>2</sup>

'My mind is gay, but my soul is melancholy', Lang is reported to have said of himself,<sup>3</sup> and it is the melancholy soul that is so seldom seen which gives to *The Gold of Fairnilee* an undefinable quality that raises it above all or nearly all of Lang's imaginative writing, and sets it on a level with the best of his poems.

The influence which so overcame Lang's habitual gay reserve in this case was his love of the Scottish Border and the memory of his earlier days spent there. 'It's only a lot of childish reminiscences of old times in a better place than 1 Marloes Road', he writes to Rider Haggard,<sup>4</sup> and goes on with his usual under-estimation of his own work, 'I dare say you would have made more of the Scotch treasure, much to Arrowsmith's [the Publisher] advantage, but I can't do fiction'.

Fairnilee, near his home in Selkirk, was the dearest spot to Lang of all the Border, and in writing of it he recaptures all the beauty and simplicity of the golden days which he spent there, and all the romantic associations of those days: 'It was worth while to be a boy then in the south of Scotland, and to fish the waters haunted by old legends, musical with old songs. . . . Memory . . . brings vividly back the golden summer evenings by Tweedside, when trout began to plash in the stillness—brings back the long, lounging, solitary days beneath the woods of Ashiesteil—days so lovely that they sometimes in the end begat a superstitious eeriness. One seemed forsaken in an enchanted world; one might see the two white fairy deer flit by, bringing to us, as to Thomas the Rhymer, the tidings that we must back to Fairyland . . .'.<sup>5</sup>

These were the influences that produced *The Gold of Fairnilee*, and from these influences came naturally the style which shows Lang at his very best, shows the spiritual rather than the physical delight, the intellectual imagination, the clear cold directness of a dream or fairy-tale that makes Lang's writings so different from those of William Morris, who at

<sup>1</sup> Sidney Colvin, *Memories and Notes*, 1921, p. 118.

<sup>2</sup> H. Rider Haggard, *The Days of My Life*, 1926, vol. i, p. 228.

<sup>3</sup> Mrs. Lang, Introduction to *Poetical Works of Andrew Lang*, 1923.

<sup>4</sup> Letter to Haggard: unpublished manuscript preserved at Ditchingham House, n.d. (about 1888).

<sup>5</sup> *Angling Sketches*, 1891, pp. 18 and 35.

first sight appears so closely akin. To illustrate Lang's method in *The Gold of Fairnilee*, the creation of atmosphere and feeling with little description or wealth of detail, I take the passage which tells of Jean's approach to the Wishing Well on the fatal midsummer eve when she goes to win back the lost Randal from the power of the Fairy Queen:

It seemed as if something within her was moving her in a kind of dream. She felt herself going on through the forest, she did not know where. Deeper into the wood she went, and now it grew so dark that she saw scarcely anything; only she felt the fragrance of briar roses, and it seemed to her that she was guided towards these roses. Then she knew that there was a hand in her hand, though she saw nobody, and the hand seemed to lead her on. And she came to an open place in the forest, and there the silver light shone clear from the sky, and she saw a great shadowy rosetree covered with white wild roses.<sup>1</sup>

Lang's other three original fairy stories fall into a different category from either of the earlier books. The first two, *Prince Prigio* (1889) and *Prince Ricardo* (1893), can conveniently be considered together as *Chronicles of Pantouflia*, under which title they appeared (together with *The Gold of Fairnilee*) in *My Own Fairy Book* (1895), and as a separate volume in 1932 and 1943. Lang's last fairy story, *Tales of a Fairy Court* (1907), need hardly be mentioned, for it is merely a not very inspired attempt to recapture the atmosphere and contents of the two previous volumes in the series.

The Pantouflia stories are in the tradition of Thackeray's *The Rose and the Ring* which was always Lang's favourite among literary fairy stories. 'The old, old fairy tales . . . are the best;' he says, 'it is a very difficult thing indeed to write a good fairy story nowadays, but if I know a really good one it is *The Rose and the Ring*.'<sup>2</sup> While no modern story could be compared with the traditional tales, Lang considered that Thackeray's method was the most successful that could be attempted by a modern writer. This itself is developed from Madame d'Aulnoy's courtly fairy stories, which were themselves inspired by Perrault's polished re-tellings of folk-tales: in England the French court tales lingered out a dreary and uninspired existence in moralized versions such as 'Catherine Calico's' *Fairy Tales* (1826) until the fairy world was rejuvenated by Grimm's *Märchen* (which first appeared in English in 1823).

In 1884 (the year of Lang's birth), appeared *The Hope of the Katzekopfs* by the Rev. F. E. Paget. This is perhaps the earliest and certainly one of the best of the 'Fairy Court' stories which combine the elements of Madame d'Aulnoy and Grimm together with humorous or even burlesque style of treatment. Eleven years later Thackeray in his fairy story completes the process by adding much of the spirit (and in some cases even echoes of

<sup>1</sup> *The Gold of Fairnilee*, 1888, pp. 56-57.

<sup>2</sup> Lang's Preface to Irene Maunder's *The Plain Princess*, 1905.

the language) of Fielding's *Tom Thumb the Great*. And Lang's Pantouffia stories, though in a gentler vein, follow very much in Thackeray's wake.

The mildly satirical courtly tale is a far easier form of literature to write than anything approaching the old tales, and it was also a type of writing that came most easily to Lang, who confesses that he is possessed of 'the literary *follet* who delights in mild mischief'.<sup>1</sup> Yet in essentials *The Chronicles of Pantouffia* go contrary to Lang's own ideals in that they are burlesques, however kindly, of the old tales. Of course he was inventing no new *genre* when he wrote them, but merely carrying the method of Paget, Thackeray, and Tom Hood one step further, even as they had improved on the methods of the *Cabinet des Fées*, but it is a lower and commoner form of art than *The Gold of Fairnilee*, and a disappointment after the unique quality of the earlier book. In their own kind, however, they are excellent, and occasional touches of the 'melancholy soul' behind the 'gay mind', besides the habitual cleverness of the 'gay mind', raise them far above the ordinary run of such stories, causing them to retain their freshness and charm unimpaired—qualities that are never more perfectly displayed throughout all Lang's writings than here.

Yet in spite of these delightful stories, in spite of the surpassing excellence of *The Gold of Fairnilee*, we do well to remember Andrew Lang by the old, old tales which he edited between covers of a dozen different colours: for these were always the dearest to him of all the stories in the world—dearer even at times than the writings of his favourite poet, Homer, and his favourite novelist, Scott. Partly, too, they were dear for the memory of the old days and the old places, the wistful melancholy that is so well illustrated by some of the lines he wrote at the end of *The Princess Nobody* in 1884—lines as true when he edited *The Lilac Fairy Book* in 1910 as they were then:<sup>2</sup>

*Au temps jadis*, as Perrault says,  
In half remembered fairy days,  
'There lived a King once and a Queen  
As few there are, as more have been—'  
Ah still we love the well worn phrase,  
Still love to tread the ancient ways,  
To break the fence, to thread the maze,  
To see the beauty we have seen  
Au temps jadis!

ROGER LANCELYN GREEN.

<sup>1</sup> Memoir by Lang in Robert F. Murray, *His Poems*, 1894, p. lxiii.

<sup>2</sup> *The Princess Nobody*, 1884, p. 56. Never reprinted.

## REVIEWS

**Ælfric's De Temporibus Anni.** Edited from all the known MSS. and fragments, with an Introduction, Sources, Parallels and Notes by HEINRICH HENEL. Published for the Early English Text Society by Oxford University Press. 1942. Pp. lviii+106, with frontispiece facsimile page of manuscript. 21s. net.

It is now just over a hundred years since Thomas Wright published his *Treatises on Popular Science written during the Middle Ages*. Yet the need for a background of mediæval knowledge for the student of mediæval literature which this and the greater work of Oswald Cockayne of 1866 (both of these contain Ælfric's *De Temporibus Anni*) sought to meet, remains in large measure still unmet. He who would know exactly what our ancestors of the eleventh century believed about the world and just how they applied their science and observations, must still make a pretty wide search in varied works often not easily accessible. There is good reason, therefore, for the general student of Old English literature, as well as for the Anglo-Saxon specialist, to welcome Professor Henel's competent and handy edition on modern principles of Ælfric's *De Temporibus Anni*, a simple little treatise 'for the plain man' (as we now say) which has never been properly edited, and indeed not at all with any attempt at completeness since its appearance in Cockayne's *Leechdoms Wortcunning and Starcraft of Early England*, of which it forms part, with a translation, of the third volume (Rolls Series, 1866).

The value of Ælfric's *De Temporibus Anni* lies, for the most part, in the fact that it tells us in a clear and easily intelligible form just what Ælfric thought the non-scholastic readers of his day should know and believe about such matters as the nature and origins of the seasons, stars, planets and comets, the winds and rain, and what is the cause of thunder. In so far as these things may be related to the Scriptures and questions of faith, it also teaches us what was, in simplified form, the doctrine of the Church of England at the close of the tenth century. As usual, its author claims to be nothing more than compiler, and selects and simplifies his material from Bede's *De Temporum Ratione*, the best text-book then available, supplemented from Bede's *De Temporibus* with perhaps an occasional addition from Isidore.

Besides the text, edited from what is clearly the best—and contemporary—manuscript, we are given an elaborate study of the relationship of the eight manuscripts which contain the piece in whole or in part, followed by the usual studies of authorship, date, sources, etc. A translation is not provided, since Cockayne had already done this, and—it may be added—the text presents scarcely any difficulty; nor is a glossary thought necessary: but the text is followed by a commentary in which all matters of interpretation and points needing special explanation are clearly handled. There is no bibliography other than a list of previous editions, and nothing—beyond a passing reference—is said of the language of the basic manuscript (Cambridge University Library Gg. 3. 28) or of any other version. The text is printed in a form something between a diplomatic and a modern edited form, retaining the original punctua-

tion but introducing some modern capitalization. The passages from Bede and the Vulgate which Ælfric used for his compilation are printed on the opposite pages to the text for convenient comparison, as are also some useful parallel passages from other sources.

The Introduction is narrower in scope than could be wished, especially in its lack of discussion of the general background to its subject. But from it three points of interest to students of Ælfric may be mentioned as definitely adding to our knowledge. The date of the *De Temporibus Anni* is fixed with strong probability at 993, the chronology of Ælfric's earlier work is reconsidered in a somewhat new light, and a new and very striking detail is suggested plausibly for his biography. The biographical point is the most important, since, if accepted with the corollaries Professor Henel tentatively proposes, it would cause a minor revolution in Ælfric studies. In chapter VI, section 18 (p. 18), in speaking of *Engla land* (which corresponds to Bede's *Britannia*), Ælfric says that 'In the north of the same country the nights are light in summer as if it were daylight all night through, *as we ourselves have very often seen*'.<sup>1</sup> Does this statement, not found in any of the known sources, mean that the author had himself seen the phenomena while living in northern England? If so, since his life after his going to school at Winchester at about the age of sixteen is fairly clearly known in outline till his going to Eynsham as Abbot, are we to infer that Ælfric, the acknowledged fountain-head of our Late West-Saxon, was in fact born in the north of England and there spent his boyhood? The words 'as we ourselves have seen (*swa swa we sylfe gesawon*)' may be merely a formula, though they appear to have been used only once similarly in his works; or again, the statement may be something less than a direct claim personally to have witnessed the phenomena. But when Professor Henel allows himself to speculate on possible 'lapses into Anglian' by Ælfric in his early work through the recency of his Northern boyhood, and even to suggest that Anglian forms found in manuscripts of such works may be Ælfric's, not the scribe's (p. xlvi), most readers who have studied the question of Ælfric's language will be shocked. It is, as has been said above, much to be regretted that Professor Henel has not thought it necessary to include some study of the language of his text in his Introduction; nor does the Commentary touch at any point on anything linguistic other than lexicographical.

The text is, so far as checking here and there can show, accurate. But one misses any new detailed description of the basic manuscript. There is an excellent historical survey of the manuscripts in the Introduction, in which new light is thrown on the way in which the Cambridge University MS. came to be in the University Library: but the editor has been content throughout to rely for descriptions of the manuscripts themselves on the well-known authorities, from Wanley to the late M. R. James, without himself giving us a first-hand impression. Orthographic peculiarities, shapes of letters, use of accents over vowels, quality of hand-writing—all these have their value to the student of a late Anglo-Saxon text. The quasi-diplomatic method of presenting the text mentioned earlier in this review has led to one definitely misleading result—misleading at least to the non-specialist. The common Old English accent placed over vowels—to indicate stress, avoid ambiguity in homonyms, show length, etc.—is shaped rather like a lengthened and irregular acute accent: nor is there anything in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts (though a *macron* is sometimes used) that

<sup>1</sup> 'On ðam ylcan earde norðeweardan beoð leohte nihta on sumera swilce hit calle niht dagige swa swa we sylfe for oft gesawon.'

in any way resembles the circumflex (^). But Professor Henel has chosen to use the circumflex throughout to indicate the manuscript accentuation, and prints such forms as *gód, láreow, hē*, etc. The Cambridge University Library MS. Gg. 3. 28 is a particularly well written and accurate version of Ælfric's *Homiliae Catholicae* as well as of the *De Temporibus Anni*, and it is undoubtedly among those most worthy of detailed study in the whole Anglo-Saxon corpus. What valuable results are to be expected from such a study has already been demonstrated by Mr. K. Sisam to some extent.<sup>1</sup> It is therefore all the more to be regretted that Professor Henel's scheme did not provide for a new first-hand impression or description of the basic manuscript itself.

Though there is no set bibliography, Professor Henel has fully documented his work, and a bibliography could be made up from his footnotes. The absence of a glossary is perhaps justified by the relative simplicity and familiarity of the vocabulary and syntax of the text; and words of lexicographical interest are dealt with effectively in his Commentary. This latter contains a good deal that is of interest (cf. the discussion of chapter VI, 18 on pp. 94-5), and throws clear light on the very few difficulties of interpretation (cf. especially the explanation of chapter IX, 5 on pp. 101-2).

The Early English Text Society is to be congratulated on a useful and competent, if not an altogether satisfying, addition to its publications, and one which maintains the standard it has been found possible to aim at in recent years.

C. L. WRENN.

**Chaucer's Irregular -E. A Demonstration among Monosyllabic Nouns of the Exceptions to Grammatical and Metrical Harmony.** By RUTH BUCHANAN MCGIMSEY. New York: King's Crown Press. 1942. Pp. x+248. \$2.00. Photolithographed.

The purpose of this book is to examine some of the apparent irregularities in Chaucer's pronunciation of final -e which still puzzle the reader of his verse, even though the chief rules for his treatment of -e and the most notable exceptions to them have long been understood. As its title indicates, the author has restricted her investigation to the use (or disuse) of 'irregular -e' with monosyllabic nouns, though incidentally she has accumulated a good deal of evidence about other parts of speech (see p. vii). Even with this drastic limitation of her field, her task has been a large one. She has examined the treatment of every monosyllabic noun recorded in Tatlock and Kennedy's *Concordance* in every line in which it occurs, using as chief evidence of pronunciation its scansion and the forms with which it rhymes. She has arranged in classes all the nouns which could be suspected of irregularity in regard to final -e and presented these classes, together with the evidence for them, in a 'Demonstration' which occupies most of her book. For convenience, the Demonstration is preceded by an 'Epitome' of her results.

Many of her findings confirm, and add detail to, the conclusions of earlier investigators; a few of them are new. Both kinds are valuable, if they can be accepted as proven. It is probable that, in the main, they can be, for many of them are supported by a great deal of unassailable evidence; but some degree of doubt about them is inevitable, for there are too many signs that Miss McGimsey has been insufficiently critical of her material.

The most obvious of these is her over-confidence in edited texts. It was

<sup>1</sup> *Review of English Studies*, vol. VII (1931), vol. VIII (1932), and vol. IX (1933).

natural enough that she should use the *Concordance* as the starting point of her investigations, but this, and the Globe edition on which it was based, needed to be supplemented, to a far greater extent than she appears to have recognized, by reference to manuscript readings. Some of her remarks, indeed, suggest that she has no very clear idea of the relative values, for her purpose, of editorial and manuscript readings. For instance, in her statement that, whenever the reading of the *Concordance* raised a doubt about the significance of *-e* 'Robinson, Manly, and any other likely source of evidence or opinion' were consulted (p. 3), there is no recognition of the fact that some of Robinson's texts, including his text of the *Canterbury Tales*, are based on a selection of the available manuscripts and are admittedly somewhat eclectic (cf. Robinson, *Introd.*, pp. xxxii, xxxiii); and, in the context, it is not clear whether, by 'Manly', she means his critical text of the *Tales* or—a very different matter—his *Corpus of Variants*. Reference to manuscript readings shows that, quite often, the 'evidence' from scansion which Miss McJimsey has culled from edited texts or from the *Concordance* is unreliable or ambiguous in its implications. Two examples must suffice. On p. 102 the scansion of *Canterbury Tales* B 422 is given as the first example of the pronunciation of 'blisse' without final *-e*, presumably because the *Concordance* and the Globe edition read 'To worldly blisse! Spreynd is with bitternesse'. But Manly's *Corpus of Variants* shows that it is mainly the inferior manuscripts that have 'is', and the reading of his critical text and of the better manuscripts ('To worldly blisse spreynd with bitternesse') demands that 'blisse' shall be pronounced with final *-e*. On p. 57, as evidence of the pronunciation of 'gate' with final *-e*, Miss McJimsey gives 'A 1906 var li' and '1906 var TC49' (*sic*). This is taken, without comment, from the *Concordance*. Actually, the manuscript variants of A 1906 are numerous and most of them lack the word 'gate' altogether, so that one cannot be quite certain that Chaucer's form, or forms, of the line contained this word; the line is, in fact, well known to students of Chaucer's text as a crux and should not have been quoted as evidence for the pronunciation of any word.

Miss McJimsey's use of spelling as evidence of pronunciation is often open to criticism of a similar kind. Though, in her Introduction (p. 14), she appears to recognize the danger of relying on manuscript spellings for this purpose, yet, in the body of her work, she refers more than once to 'Chaucerian spelling' as evidence (cf., p. 103, 'the Chaucerian spelling *quene* is used for both words', i.e. modern 'queen' and 'quean'; p. 109, 'Press appeared . . . also with the Chaucerian *prees* spelling and pronunciation'). To the present writer it is not clear what is meant by 'Chaucerian spelling'. It can hardly mean the spelling actually used by Chaucer himself, for of this we have no certain knowledge. It seems just possible that it may mean Robinson's spelling, since Miss McJimsey states that she found this 'useful as confirmatory . . . evidence' (p. 14), and she mentions it fairly often, sometimes as such, and frequently as having some claim to authority (cf. p. 103 'sight', p. 134 'skill', 'sleet', p. 153 'head', p. 154 'keep', etc.). If it does, the present writer would refer to her review of Robinson's edition in *Medium Ævum*, vol. VII, for proof of Robinson's inconsistency in the treatment of final *-e*. If it means the spelling of even the best manuscripts, then it is not irrelevant to refer to an earlier issue of *R.E.S.* (XVIII, Jan. 1942, p. 107) for some remarks on the relation between the spelling of the best manuscripts (especially Ellesmere, which most modern editors have largely followed) and Chaucer's pronunciation.

Sufficient care has not always been exercised either in regard to scansion or in the use of linguistic apparatus. As part of her proof that 'Chaucer could readily put a monosyllabic noun without *-e* into the arsis' (i.e. according to her own definition, into the 'unstressed, or first, part of the iamb', see p. 115) Miss McJimsey gives four passages which purport to illustrate the use of 'al' in this position (see p. 116). Three of these quite certainly contain a stressed 'al'; they are, in fact, cases of what Miss McJimsey calls 'trochaization' (cf., for example, the first, 'Al was .fee symple to hym in effect'). And a number of the other examples given on p. 116 are of the same kind. These unfortunate errors may be the outcome of the somewhat cavalier attitude, expressed on p. 10, towards the whole business of "substituted trochees", or reversed rhythm, or wrenched accent'. As for Miss McJimsey's use of linguistic apparatus, a note on p. 16 indicates a significant preference for Clark Hall's *Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* over the fuller 'Bosworth-Toller'; and a glance at the Old English forms given as the origin of Chaucerian words will show that a number of them have been copied, usually from Clark Hall, occasionally from other dictionaries, without thought of whether they are, in reality, the direct ancestors of the Chaucerian forms (cf. 'eld', referred to A.S. 'ieldu', 'ield'; 'file', to A.S. 'féol'; 'much', to A.S. 'micel'; 'sloth', to A.S. 'sléwð'; 'wreche', 'vengeance', to A.S. 'wræc', 'wraču' instead of to A.S. 'wræc', see *O.E.D.*, 'wreche'). Other instances of carelessness or uncertainty in linguistic matters could be given; but this would be merely labouring the point.

One other defect of the book should not, however, be passed in silence—the awkwardness and inexactness of the language in which it is written. The English reader has no right to object to some of the usages which strike him as unfamiliar, but which are, presumably, current American idiom; but readers on both sides of the Atlantic may object to sentences which are so awkward as to be almost unintelligible (cf. for example, the last sentence of the second paragraph on p. 115), and to frequent inexactitudes such as 'the relative reliability of the poems', p. 13 (which may mean the relative reliability either of the texts, or, of the manuscripts, of the poems). Most serious of these is the use of the word 'evidence' to cover, not merely what really is evidence, but also factors that must be taken into account in deciding the value of evidence (cf. pp. 13, 14, where the reliability of texts and the frequency with which a word occurs are termed 'evidence'—of pronunciation, apparently—equally with the scansion of a word or the forms with which it rhymes).

DOROTHY EVERETT.

**English Prayer Books. An Introduction to the Literature of Christian Public Worship.** By STANLEY MORISON. Cambridge, at the University Press 1943. Pp. viii + 143. 6s. net.

There could be no better beginning of the new series entitled 'Problems of Worship', edited by the Deans of St. Paul's and Liverpool. No existing book of this modest compass contains such a full and accurate account of the service-books used in this country through the centuries. The scientific study of liturgies is comparatively modern, and the revisers of the early sixteenth century, such as Quignonez, Hermann of Wied and Cranmer, had to work without the apparatus which became available soon after their day. Mr. Morison's detailed description of the mediæval books will be welcome to students of literature for the light which it throws, for instance, on Chaucer's 'litel clergeon seven years of age',

learning his primer and antiphoner. With the advent of printing Mr. Morison's unrivalled knowledge of typography is brilliantly employed; nothing escapes his vigilant eye, and the significance of every detail is revealed. Well-deserved praise is given to the Benedictines, who not only from the first gave infinite care to the printing of service-books, in order to maintain the high standard set by the hand-written missals and breviaries, but have also furnished down to our own time a long line of learned liturgiologists.

Service-books for English use were largely printed abroad. The Paris houses won special distinction in this field, and there was also the famous Plantin Press at Antwerp. After Mary's reign no breviary was printed in England until 1830. It is interesting to note how long the Sarum use continued to be printed abroad until it was superseded by the Tridentine. Mr. Morison is not sparing of his praise of the best examples of Anglican printing; he calls Baskerville's work superior to any continental production of the time, and says of the *Altar Service Book* of 1867 that 'at the time of its execution it probably deserved to rank as the finest piece of liturgical printing in all Europe'. But he sees need for improvement in the style of printing *The Book of Common Prayer*.

The historical and theological comments reflect the author's mind, and there are some inaccuracies, due partly to extreme compression, partly to oversight. In the seven pre-Reformation sees, named on p. 30, with secular chapters, the bishops were not elected 'by the conjoint suffrages of monks and secular canons'; this was true only of Bath & Wells and Lichfield & Coventry, which had two cathedral churches, one served by Benedictines, the other by secular canons; Mr. Morison does not mention these two sees, and probably a sentence has dropped out. There is an incomplete sentence about Bonner's instructions on p. 51, and the date must be wrong. Elizabeth's injunctions are incorrectly cited on pp. 54-5. The general reader will not realize that the *Order of the Communion* of 1548 was an English interpolation in the unaltered Latin mass.

Mr. Morison pays some attention to the recent development of liturgical use in the Free Churches, and he rightly foresees that it is likely to go much further, for 'the liturgy has come to stay'.

The value of this book is greatly increased by the full references to the best works of liturgical scholarship, and to the special libraries, such as the one, mainly derived from the Wordsworth collections, now made available by the generosity of Sir Frederick Radcliffe.

F. E. HUTCHINSON.

**The Evolution of 'The Faerie Queene.'** By JOSEPHINE WATERS BENNETT. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; London: Cambridge University Press. 1942. Pp. x+299.

Every reader has noticed the uncertainty of Spenser's conduct of *The Faerie Queene*. Every critic, I fancy, has perceived it his duty to give some rational account of it; and every critic (including myself) has recoiled from the labour of the necessary preliminary analysis. Mrs. Bennett has set herself, courageously and with success, to make such an analysis, and thereby to give some account of how the poem grew under Spenser's hand. Beginning with the entirely reasonable hypotheses that the episodes were not necessarily designed in the order of their present appearance, and that the Letter to Raleigh represents his notion of the scheme in 1590 but not necessarily in 1580, she investigates the main conceptions of the Faerie Queene and Prince Arthur, and continues with separate studies of each Book.

Mrs. Bennett finds her first clue to the history of the poem in Gabriel Harvey's remark that Spenser imitated and wished to 'overgo' Ariosto. She looks for the most Ariostian passages in the poem and finds them in certain passages of Book III. Here, she says, is the genesis of the poem. Her critical acuteness is to be admired, and I for one do not seek to disprove her argument, because the thing is not susceptible of real proof on the evidence we have. The difficulty of reviewing such a book as this is just that one is tempted to take the same material and make another story out of it, which would require another large book, no more conclusive and certainly less valuable. To a young man of Spenser's training, the sure way to overgo Ariosto would be to remedy the fault complained of by all the critics, his desultory handling of the story; and the way to do this might well be by stiffening the structure with the epic framework. A strict care for formal qualities is a common sign of immaturity, and it may be that the comparatively firm contour of Book I and its theoretical protestantism are both marks of Cambridge. The loosening of form in later Books may be a sign of confidence, equally with the less dogmatic religion.

It is impossible to assume one trend of change in Spenser's critical ideas, and we know little or nothing of the sequence of his reading and of his private experience. So Mrs. Bennett is on the only safe ground when she bases her main chapters on the public experience he shared with his contemporaries. She has a proper sense of the fitfulness of the historical allegory and is not unduly dogmatic, though it would have done no harm to have remembered more continuously the probability that Spenser had all his experience in mind. The Arthegall of Book V, for instance, may represent not this or that Governor or Lord Deputy, but any or all of them. They all tried to do their duty according to their lights, and they all suffered for it. When Mrs. Bennett, therefore, insists on Sir John Norris, we may agree but add Grey and Perrott and Bingham and a vague memory of Sir Henry Sidney. The difficulty about all such questions is that they depend not on the matured (and rarely impartial) judgments of historians, but on the current (and never impartial) judgments of gossiping clerks and reminiscent officials. Grey clearly impressed Spenser more than any of them. Spenser was in close touch with him as private secretary, and Grey was Spenser's first chief. My own impression, gathered from the Irish papers but difficult to fix by citation, is that Grey was successful with the officials as Perrott was not. The extent to which men's judgments are influenced by great issues is undoubtedly variable. It may be true, as Mrs. Bennett says, that 'the rebellion of Desmond in 1580 and that of Tyrone in 1593 and the following years were parts of the same great, fundamentally religious and ideological conflict'—though I doubt the religious foundation and do not know what she means by 'ideological'—but what are people saying in American offices and clubs in this election year? Is all judgment based only on the fundamentally moral and philosophical conflict now raging? And when men look back and isolate the great issues, will not the protagonists they visualize be chosen and modified and conflated according to minor, personal, and often unconscious bias?

Yet though one may differ in the reading of history, Mrs. Bennett is right in following the one moderately safe guide. Growth in poetry means growth in thought, and Spenser's changes of mind may be due less to artistic uncertainty, or the pressure of events, than to a growing desire to deal more fully with philosophical notions. Thus Books III and IV may be chaotic not only because they are patchworks of early fragments but even more because Spenser, having

involved himself in a disquisition on love (the foundation of true chastity), became more involved in the exhaustive treatment of his subject than in the people he began by inventing. He ranges from Petrarch to Lucretius, from Plato to Raleigh, all the more eagerly that the subject was one near his heart. Mrs. Bennett distinguishes admirably between the book-work of Cantos i-iv of Book V, which Spenser conscientiously 'got up' from Aristotle, and the rest of the Book, in which he studies Justice as he saw it in contemporary politics; she has little to say of Book VI (though she recognizes its value) because the matter is largely one of contemporary and traditional values, depending little on treatises and in social rather than political terms. Yet it is the best example of Spenser's comprehensive treatment of a congenial virtue.

No serious student of Spenser can dispense with this book. Whether one agrees with every detail or not, and whether its main theses are or are not absorbed into the common understanding of scholars, it will stand as a most useful piece of work which will earn for its author the gratitude of everyone who has grappled with its vast and complicated subject.

W. L. RENWICK.

**Francis Bacon on Communication and Rhetoric.** By KARL R. WALLACE. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press; London: H. Milford. 1943. Pp. ix+277. 30s. net.

It is significant that Bacon's observations on rhetoric are not to be found in any one treatise nor in his literary work only but in his scientific and philosophical writings. To him it is more than a 'garnishing' of thought; it is a force directed to the reason of the individual to influence action for good. This it does, in his view, by recommending reason to imagination 'in order to excite the appetite and the will', the agents which impel action. Bacon shares with Plato a distrust of poetic unreason, imagination uncontrolled, and he separates rhetoric from its older coincidence with poetic and from the study of style which had been stressed by his immediate predecessors, Cox, Sherry, and Wilson. For him, the end of rhetoric is the effective means of presenting images and observations to illuminate his discourse for his audience, 'to second reason and not to oppress it'. Style is purely functional, the choice of speech most appropriate to the speaker, the subject matter and the audience. From the comments scattered throughout the vast body of Bacon's writings, Professor Wallace has built up the whole view of rhetoric as a part of logic in the hierarchy of knowledge, and the later chapters provide Bacon's setting in the long line of rhetoricians from Plato and Aristotle onwards. Here there is a slight fault of perspective, since he does not take into full account the relations of rhetoric and the vernacular in the Tudor period. The preoccupation with style was necessary at this testing time in the development of the language and rhetoric had the stamp of authority. The time was not ripe for such a fully philosophical and all-embracing conception as that of Bacon.

There are a few faults of expression, including occasional inconsistencies in terminology, such as the appearance of unusual, even incorrect, references to 'the Baron of Verulam' and the 'Lord of Verulam'; the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (p. 169) as the *Rhetoric to Herrenius* (p. 5). These are slight lapses compared with the quantity of material useful to the student of Bacon, and for those who wish to pursue the study of rhetoric farther there is an excellent bibliography, including a list of works on rhetoric printed on the Continent which have not been brought together before.

ELIZABETH J. SWEETING.

**The Forgotten Hume. Le bon David.** By ERNEST CAMPBELL MOSSNER. New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1943. Pp. xvi+251. 20s. net.

Mr. Mossner says in his Foreword that while books pour from the press about Hume the philosopher, Hume the man, *le bon David*, as George Keith, Earl Marischal of Scotland called him, is forgotten. But is this so? His contemporaries dwelt on his affability and goodness. 'His constant pleasantry was the genuine effusion of good nature and good humour', said Adam Smith. Burton, Huxley and Greig did not forget these aspects of his character. The really interesting question is, Why do so many of his contemporaries say that David was not only *bon* but naïve and even 'simple'? 'His (the Reverend John Jardine's) playful vivacity often amused itself in a sort of mock contest with the infantile (if I may use such a phrase when speaking of such a man) simplicity of David Hume' (Mackenzie's *Life of Hume*, p. 14). His curiosity and credulity were without bounds, said 'Jupiter' Carlyle. As innocent as the serpent and as wise as a dove?

Mr. Mossner has not re-discovered Hume the Man, but, in seven entertaining essays based on much research in Edinburgh that was interrupted by the war, has filled in some details in the well-known character. That on Hume and Wallace contains most new matter, for here he had the advantage of using fully for the first time the Wallace manuscripts in the Library of Edinburgh University. 'Dr. Wallace, minister of the New North Church and one of the deans of the Chapel Royal', says Somerville, 'had more originality of mind than any minister in Edinburgh.' He with Professor Colin Maclaurin helped Dr. Webster to found the Ministers' Widows and Children's Fund, and he was one of the founders of the Philosophical Society. His chief connection with Hume was his controversy with him over the populousness of ancient nations which was conducted so amicably that Rousseau said of it: 'Cette conduite étoit dans mon tour d'esprit'. One curious thing about him was that he launched out daringly on a number of daring subjects (e.g. *Of Venery or the Natural Commerce of the two sexes*), then put his discourses in a drawer to slumber for two centuries. Among them was a *Letter to David Hume Esquire controverting his footnote to Of National Characters*, in which he had attacked the clergy. Another was a defence of Hume against the Reverend George Anderson's attempt to have his writings examined by a committee of the General Assembly. 'Printed Edinburgh, 1756', runs the title of the manuscript, but it never saw the printing-house. It is difficult to call a man a bold thinker who acted so circumspectly. But the General Assembly had still the power to make men walk fearfully in 1756. The whole story illustrates very well the theme of *le bon David*.

In the chapters on Dr. Blacklock, the Reverend William Wilkie and the Reverend John Home, Mr. Mossner amuses himself by hailing them with mock pomposity as the Scottish Pindar, the Scottish Homer and the Scottish Shakespeare. Well, of course, a caddie did call from the gallery on the first night of *Douglas*, 'Whaur's your Wullie Shakespeare noo?' and Hume did maintain that the *Epigoniad* was the second of English epics. But the caddie was a wag—at least that's how Scotsmen take it—and Hume could be very naïve in his judgments of literature, and men. Did he not prefer Addison to Bunyan? Even of his favourites, Ariosto and Tasso, his criticisms are seldom on the bull's eye. There was a much better poet than any of the three up in Aberdeen, the poet of *The Minstrel*. Further, the revival of poetry in Scotland owes far more to Allan

Ramsay, Robert Ferguson, Bishop Percy, and Alexander Ross than to any of them.

Many interesting points are raised in these chapters and there are some interesting gleanings from manuscripts and out-of-the-way sources. Why did Dr. Blacklock turn against Hume after he so long had exerted himself might and main for the 'silly fellow'? Was he bowled over by Aberdeen University's giving him a D.D.? Or was it that all along he had been uneasy under the patronage of the Defensor Fidei, as the Earl Marischal of Scotland had called Hume? There is an essay 'On the Immortality of the Soul' at the end of the Poems of 1756. He had written in 'On the Refinements of Modern Philosophy':

Let Logic's sons, mechanic throng,  
Their syllogistic war prolong,  
And reason's empire boast:  
Inshrin'd in deep congenial gloom,  
Eternal wrangling be their doom,  
To truth and nature lost.

Mr. Mossner has sought everywhere for the letter to Beattie in which Blacklock narrates his dealings with Hume, but in vain so far. No doubt it will turn up.

The section on the squibs and satires that accompanied Home's play is amusing, particularly the account of John Maclaurin's *The Philosopher's Opera*. When Genius (Hume) goes out the Devil remarks: 'Faith, I don't know well what to think of him. Are you sure he is true blue on our side? I confess, I have some suspicion, that he is a shrewd fellow, endeavouring to convert men to Christianity, by writing nonsense against it'. The account of Wilkie of *The Epigoniad* is fuller than I have read elsewhere, but he still remains too much a scarecrow, the kind of professor (for he became Professor of Natural Philosophy in St. Andrews) who gets clothed with the ragged jests of hoary antiquity. Not that I distrust his story of his confounding Mr. Roebuck of Carron Iron Works by reciting Homer to him as he drove away the birds from the corn, for before the war one could have found his match any summer in Scotland, holding back a leash of dogs at a shoot, or shouting 'Kirn, Dunoon and Rothesay' at the gangway of the *Jeannie Deans*. Mr. Mossner jocosely calls him 'this god-brute' following Charles Townsend's remark that he had never met a man who approached so near to the two extremes of a god and a brute as Doctor Wilkie. He should take into account Sir Robert Liston's letter to the Man of Feeling where he points out that Townsend made the remark in the course of free and unweighed conversation.

In one chapter Mr. Mossner gives us his version of the Rousseau-Hume quarrel, seeing more of the 'guid Dauvit' in it than does Mr. Greig and much more than M. Roddier and Miss Margaret Peoples. In another he gives us a portrait of Boswell in his relations with Hume, dipping his brush freely in the Malahide palette. Finally comes a full-dress comparison of the merits and peculiarities of Hume and Johnson. As far as I can make out the one had not read the *Treatise on Human Nature* and the other was oblivious of the *Preface to Shakespeare*.

Scotsmen of the Lowlands have no 'brogue'. The Rev. Dr. Robertson can hardly have been Moderator of the Edinburgh Assembly from 1762 to 1780. A Moderator is appointed for only one year. Properly speaking there never was an *Edinburgh Assembly*.

W. D. TAYLOR.

**The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence. Vols. 9-10.** Edited by W. S. LEWIS and RALPH S. BROWN, Jr. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1941. Vol. 9 (I) correspondence with George Montagu, pp. lvi+418. Vol. 10 (II) the same continued with Appendices and Index, pp. viii+560. £4 14s. 6d. net the set.

Unlike Cole and Mme. du Deffand, the correspondents of the two previous installations of this great edition, George Montagu's claim on our interest lies solely in his connection with Walpole. And unlike them again he belonged to Walpole's intimate world and, to use a trite expression, spoke the same language. There are here clearly the makings of a real correspondence.

Some 187 of Montagu's letters are printed here, mostly for the first time, and arranged with Walpole's letters to him of which there are 262. In the main they are matter-of-fact communications. They reveal an agreeable, self-indulgent, but well-read and knowledgeable man. Occasionally he arouses himself and displays a wit and touch of phrase not unworthy of his friend. The editors even think that Walpole took the model of his style from the older friend. Perhaps it is more likely that Montagu was stimulated by Walpole's example to a comparable effort. The effort was not sustained, nor, in the long run, was the friendship. Montagu survived the end of the correspondence by ten years. The reasons for this long epilogue of silence must now rest unexplained. Some breach occurred to finish the waning correspondence, and perhaps the fundamental reason was Montagu's inability to keep his friendship in repair, hints of which appear in the earlier part of the correspondence.

For us, however, Montagu served his purpose. He drew from Walpole a long series of his most brilliant letters, and both the scholar and the general reader will be glad to have this correspondence reassembled once more, as far as is ever likely to be possible, in its original sequence.

No pains have been spared to achieve this, and the dates even of missing letters, which are presumed to have existed, are recorded in their places. It is also claimed for the present text of the letters that it is more complete and accurate than that of preceding editions. The suppressed passages, which Lytton Strachey is said to have sighed for, have been restored, and the editors reflect slyly that on the whole he would have been disappointed in them. Indeed they are trivial enough though the editors labour somewhat heavily over a piece of jakes-humour (intro. p. xxiii and i. 139) that was hardly worth their indignation.

Nevertheless the text is avowedly not exactly what Walpole wrote, since the spelling and occasionally the grammar have been modernized. One may regret this, especially as trouble has been taken apparently to print with literal accuracy the memoranda which Walpole often scribbled on letters in his possession. Nor do the editors appear to have carried out their intention consistently. A list of obsolete spellings is prefixed to the text (i. xxxii), yet some of these have been left in the text. On the other hand, suspicion arises that American usage has crept in occasionally. If Walpole really wrote 'center' (i. 338 and ii. 306) the fact would have been worth noting. Toynbee at any rate printed 'centre'.

The annotation is as frequent and full and, one must add, as imperfectly digested as in the previous volumes. The world's great age begins anew. It is the Alexandrine age, the age of indefatigable students who comment for the sake of commenting and not by any means always for the readers' assistance. The editors have tracked down every identity, every locality, and every allusion, often very familiar ones, which they could detect, and when they fail they candidly

confess it with yet another note. When it comes to elucidation, however, they are less successful. They seem never to have decided whether they are annotating for scholars or for schoolboys. Between the two the average general reader will be left alternately irritated and perplexed. He does not want references to Shakespeare or the Psalms, but—*experto crede*—he would like to know what are or were—vails (i. 199) usquebaugh (*passim*), etc., and to have explanations of Pythagorean sermons (i. 378) and curule chairs, etc.

The historical and political notes are sometimes too simple or sometimes too obscure, often because they refer to learned and perhaps inaccessible books instead of giving the gist of what is to be found there. At times too the editors rely on strange authorities. Swift's poems are hardly the place in which to find the meaning of Pythagoras's precept to abstain from beans (ii. 211).

Scholars or schoolboys, the editors are determined that their readers are very innocent and are equally determined to end that state. Lytton Strachey in his turn would have chuckled over their insistence on explaining the simplest *double entendres*, sometimes with the aid of *O.E.D.* (i. 368) or of Farmer and Henley (i. 360). More erudite quips of this kind seem to have eluded them (i. 90 and 235); while a tag from Horace (i. 130) deserved a simple explanation instead of a quotation containing Latin which no schoolboy is expected to know.

The editors' handling of Latin and classical topics is uncertain. Walpole and Montagu exchanged the small currency of classical allusions in a free way that is largely lost to the Alexandrine age. These deserved more careful explanation than they get. The editors are apt to darken counsel by adding still more Latin in their notes which they seldom translate or explain. A curious series of misunderstandings may serve as a final example of the weaker side of the editing.

The editors do not appear to know that Pam was the knave of clubs in loo. It may or may not have been a nickname for the Duchess of Grafton who was a devotee of the game, though this seems a mere guess, and at i. 294 the obvious explanation of the duke's having 'some high words with Pam' seems to be that he was quarrelling not with his wife but with his luck at cards. Through this notion of a nickname they have misunderstood both the Latin and the point of the inscription (ii. 23) which Walpole proposed to put on an altar dedicated 'PAMMIO O.M.'. While in Rome, the duchess might have been involved in a disaster when the roof fell in on some assembly at which she was due. Pam had intervened and seen to it that she was playing loo elsewhere.<sup>1</sup>

A pleasing feature of the notes is the inclusion of Mrs. Piozzi's gossiping marginalia printed for the first time. There are some interesting appendices, including Cole's journal of a tour with Walpole in 1763. The illustrations are apposite and delightful. The index is as copious and exact as its predecessors. While it is necessary to point out its faults, it is a duty and a pleasure to add that this monumental edition will be a standby for students for generations.

D. M. Low.

<sup>1</sup> An acquaintance with Pam would have helped the editors to elucidate further a *jeu d'esprit* on the proposed arms for White's club (i. 186), where again they do not seem to see the full meaning of the Latin motto.

**A Bibliography of the Strawberry Hill Press with a Record of the Prices at which Copies have been Sold.** By A. T. HAZEN. Together with a Bibliography and Census of the Detached Pieces. By A. T. HAZEN and J. P. KIRBY. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942; London: Humphrey Milford, 1943. \$10.00; 66s. 6d. net.

This sumptuous volume marks another stage in the advance of eighteenth-century bibliography, and raises the question in which directions further advance is possible. What was originally intended was a mere catalogue of the Strawberry Hill imprints in Mr. W. S. Lewis's great collection at Farmington, Connecticut; and what has been produced is a comprehensive and authoritative treatise on perhaps the most famous of our private presses—the press which was set up by Horace Walpole in June 1757 and provided him with occupation and diversion for almost forty years. Mr. Lewis has withheld his name from the title page and has contributed only a brief Preface, but the book is his in origin and in its most novel feature, and he is everywhere present in it, even more in spirit than as the possessor of most of the material that is described. He has been fortunate in the assistance of Mr. A. T. Hazen and Mr. J. P. Kirby, who have shared most of the labour. Mr. Hazen, who has been known to some of us hitherto as one of the ablest of the younger Johnsonians, now takes his place in the front rank of American bibliographers. He has supplied the valuable Introduction; and he has the credit also, by his readiness to assist, of inducing Mr. Lewis to decide on a bibliography that should be as full and documented as they could reasonably make it. 'Every page', Mr. Hazen tells us, 'will show how largely I have depended on the collection at Farmington, and I am proud to add that Mr. Lewis has read over with me, and improved, nearly every page'. The book is an impressive monument to a very happy partnership.

The bibliographer of a private press has the advantage of dealing with a limited output, limited by the taste of the owner and the equipment and capacity of his press, and defined in its limits. Walpole's *Journal of the Printing Office* was on the whole carefully kept, and though it does not record every scrap of print that has survived, is an invaluable guide. Of the thirty-four 'books' printed at Strawberry Hill, twenty-nine are mentioned, and dated, in the *Journal*, and of the remainder three appear to be offprints and one is acknowledged in another of Walpole's books. In addition, the great majority of the 'detached pieces', most of which are printed on one side of a single leaf, are vouched for by the *Journal*. But the bibliographer who has the advantage of being presented with the rough map is shown by this volume to have ample scope for exercising his acumen in filling in the details. Copies bearing the same imprint may differ, though all may be genuine; the paper and the type have to be examined, for there may be forgeries. Some idea of the thoroughness of this bibliography will be gathered from the mere number of its pages. The descriptions of the 'books' and 'detached pieces' runs to two hundred and fifty quarto pages, of which eighty-five are given to facsimiles. Some puzzles have remained unsolved. They are of minor import, though little can be minor to the ardent bibliographer. Almost all the descriptions appear to be final.

The examination of paper and type is carried on unremittingly, and brings this bibliography into line with the *Enquiry into certain Nineteenth Century Pamphlets*. No doubt is left of the dishonesty of Walpole's printer, Thomas Kirgate. He was printer from 1765 till Walpole's death in March 1797 and was 'considered by his noble employer as the only honest printer he ever had'. He

may have been an honest printer till 1797. But the evidence is unassailable that after Walpole's death he made a series of reprints and put them on the market as originals. Mr. Hazen is inclined to believe that they may all have been produced in 1797, after Walpole's death but before Kirgate's departure from Strawberry Hill. Collectors who have been misled may thus have the consolation of thinking that their purchases were printed at the right place if not at the right time. No man is always dishonest. Kirgate began well, won Walpole's confidence, and then yielded to the temptation of supplementing a disappointingly small legacy. That he had already been taking advantage of his aged master cannot be proved. The question arises in connection with the thick paper copy of Gray's *Odes*, 1757, which was at one time thought to be the first issue and has now been shown, on the evidence of the paper, to have been printed not earlier than 1790 and 'quite possibly as late as 1797'. (A copy fetched \$1250 at auction in 1929.) The smallness of the legacy is commented on in the obituary notice of Walpole in *The Gentleman's Magazine* (1797, p. 257), where a bitter passage, which must have been seen by John Nichols and may have been inserted by him, will be taken to express what Kirgate felt and did not conceal: 'Mr. Thomas Kirgate (who, after having largely contributed to the extension of his Lordship's fame by the honourable support of his press for 40 years, is placed, we are sorry to observe, in his patron's will, on the footing of a menial servant, by a legacy of ONLY 100l.)'. Unfortunately Kirgate's deceptions after Walpole's death were not confined to the reprints. His manuscript annotations are shown by Mr. Hazen not to be all trustworthy, and their errors cannot all be attributed to a faulty memory.

Kirgate's position as the Strawberry Hill printer has made the proof of his guilt rest mainly on the paper which he used; but type and paper have played an equal part in the detection of a nineteenth-century group of forgeries of ten 'detached pieces'. The forger has used a packet of old paper which is not always quite old enough, and his fumbling cunning in the choice of old-style types has betrayed the limitations of his knowledge. He remains unidentified; *floruit* c. 1840?

In the methods and tools of these investigations Mr. Hazen will make no claim to novelty, but he employs them in his own manner, and with a sustained judiciousness and care that cannot easily be overrated. The novelty in this volume is no part of the modern scientific bibliography. Some may be tempted to call it a commercial intrusion, but it is very much more than that. Mr. Lewis is responsible for it, and his own words about it are the best:

The decision to print the prices, including the last one, is mine. I am aware that there has always been a certain reticence in printing these, a reticence which the collector does not always show in private conversation. It seems to me that this reticence is partly false modesty and partly affectation, for the price which books have fetched through the years is of the greatest interest to collectors and to booksellers. It may also be of interest to students of literature and to social historians: why, for example, have the novels of Surtees always fetched more than the novels of George Eliot? The price of a particular copy during many years has an even sharper interest, for linked with it is the name of its various owners, private and professional.

Changes in price point to changes in interest and fashion; and in no country do collectors and librarians pay more attention to previous ownership than in America. It is fitting that the first critical bibliography to grant prominent recognition to price and pedigree should be an American publication.

We can foresee the use that will be made of this volume by collectors, and particularly by dealers. Mr. Lewis modestly speaks of it as a fresh stimulus to collectors to continue their collecting. It has a much wider appeal. It will be welcomed by the student of bibliography, and as a contribution to our literary history it will be welcomed by the scholar. May both bear in mind Mr. Hazen's warning that 'bibliography is the scholar's servant, not his master'.

D. NICHOL SMITH.

**English Bards and Grecian Marbles.** THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SCULPTURE AND POETRY, ESPECIALLY IN THE ROMANTIC PERIOD. By STEPHEN A. LARRABEE. New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1943. Pp. xiv+312. 23s. 6d. net.

Now that this book has been written one cannot help wondering why no scholar thought of writing it before. The thesis presents a most interesting approach to literature. It is not suggested that a great statue was ever the real soul or core of a great poem—more than ever one realizes that there is an authentic boundary between the plastic and poetic arts—but, on the other hand, sculpture has become more and more a part of every poet's intellectual atmosphere, associated with his ideas on God, culture and society; more often a 'soul-adventure' than merely an occasion for verses. In fact, it seems that the Greek ideal of clear thought and creative energy could hardly be suggested otherwise, at any rate by one with a poet's sense of form and of visual expressiveness.

Mr. Larrabee does not overlook the historical aspect of his inquiry. In the Middle Ages, and up to the close of the Renaissance, the poet's knowledge of sculpture was literary. He had read of statues, and wrote of them as the shadow of nature, in form and colour indistinguishable from living people, and they were so employed on the Elizabethan stage, in what he calls 'statue-craft'. It was Dryden (Preface to *Annus Mirabilis*) and Addison (*Dialogues upon Ancient Medals*) who first widened interest by showing how well poetic imagery could be borrowed from statues and reliefs. Critics and philosophers like Shaftesbury, Winckelmann and their followers developed this idea, and revealed the spirit operating within the form, and so handed on the inspiration. Hence the Hellenism of the early nineteenth century.

But the real value of *English Bards and Grecian Marbles* is to be found in the studies of individual poets who thought and wrote about sculpture during the Romantic Movement. Mr. Larrabee is enlightening on Blake, showing how his training in classical art helped him to the perception of intellectual visions, so that he taught himself to 'endow matter with the determinate line', and to transfigure his experiences by means of symbolic mythology. With no less insight he examines how Coleridge fitted the ancient gods, and god-like heroes into his philosophy and religious scheme; how Shelley hailed them as types of enlightenment, freedom, clear-headedness; the source of Platonic love which leads to the understanding of beauty; even substantiating the doctrines of Plotinus from what he had seen in Italy and Greece.

Our author finds nothing particularly new or interesting in the poetry of Wordsworth and Byron, but he has much to say about Keats, especially when he was under the influence of the Elgin Marbles together with the disconcerting comments of his friend Haydon. His analysis of *Ode on a Grecian Urn* should be read with more than usual care. Keats loved Greek art because it expressed

pathos, emotion, and action; and also, perhaps, because it led him on to appreciate Milton. For the author of *Paradise Lost* did not merely describe his god-like figures, he *stationed* them, that is, gave them their pose and gesture. Yet perhaps it is well to be reminded that, before his death, Keats was beginning to seek inspiration elsewhere. He was already realizing that he could not reproduce the serenity of Greek art, while harassed by the conditions under which he had to live.

It is also worth remembering that the Elgin Marbles resigned their own supremacy by convincing poets that an artist should create beauty out of the ordinary life around him, as Pheidias had done.

H. V. ROUTH.

**A Dictionary of American English on Historical Principles.** Compiled at the University of Chicago under the editorship of SIR WILLIAM CRAIGIE and JAMES R. HULBERT. Part XIII, Mingo—Outdoor Life. London: Oxford University Press. 1942. Pp. 1,525-1,652. 17s. net.

'The English language has been greatly improved in Britain within a century, but its highest perfection . . . is perhaps reserved for this land of light and freedom.' This was a pious American hope in 1774. The *D.A.E.* will be, in its entirety, the most impressive record of American usage and the fullest commentary on linguistic development. As it is limited to exclude slang, or, rather, recent slang, and since it rejects words appearing since 1900, the necessity of a Supplement is clearly indicated. Comparison with the Supplement of the *O.E.D.* (1933) with its most valuable American citations, points the need still more emphatically. The debt to the English work is, obviously, very great, and Sir William Craigie has profited by his earlier labours, expanding the material used in the *O.E.D.* Detailed comparison reveals how carefully the English editors spread their net and used their spoils. It is instructive at this point to notice the difference in English and American definition. To the English mind the *D.A.E.* is sometimes less comprehensive. For instance:

'Molly Maguire'.

The *D.A.E.* is silent as to the Irish origin of the term. This information is given in the *O.E.D.* Supplement and makes the transferred use of the expression clear.

'Monitor'.

*D.A.E.* An ironclad naval vessel constructed on the model of the one invented by John Ericsson in 1862.

*O.E.D.* An ironclad having a very low free-board and one or more revolving turrets containing great guns built on the model of the vessel invented by Captain Ericsson.

*D.A.E.* An armored railroad truck equipped with a large cannon.

*O.E.D.* An ironclad railway truck carrying a big gun.

*D.A.E.* A nozzle capable of being turned completely around in a horizontal plane. Used in hydraulic mining.

*O.E.D.* A jointed nozzle used in hydraulic mining, which may be turned in any direction.

'Morgan horse'.

*D.A.E.* A superior breed of horses developed in Vermont by Justin Morgan (1747-98); also, a horse of this breed.

*O.E.D.* A breed of horse named after the progenitor, 'Justin Morgan', which was owned by a schoolmaster of the same name, of Randolph, Vermont, in 1795.

[It should be noticed, however, that this account does not tally with the *D.A.E.* citation from *The New Eng. Farmer*, 1849, I. 314, 'the original Morgan horse, raised by Justin Morgan of West Springfield, Mass., in 1793.']

'Mormon'.

The *O.E.D.* supplements the information given in the *D.A.E.* with the statement that Joseph Smith founded his church of Latter Day Saints in 1830 at Manchester, N.Y., 'on the basis of alleged Divine revelations in the "Book of Mormon" which Smith professed to have translated by special inspiration from the original writing on gold plates, miraculously discovered by himself'.

'Nester'.

*D.A.E.* An opprobrious term for one seeking to settle down permanently as a homesteader, farmer, small rancher, etc., in a cattle-grazing region.

*O.E.D.* (with pungent brevity) A squatter on a cattle-range.

The instances could be multiplied.

Borrowings from other languages are not remarkable. The most interesting are the Indian words, amongst them 'mohawk', 'Mohave' (surely used attributively of the desert?), 'moose', 'mugwump', 'Navaho', 'Ohio', 'Oklahoma', and 'Ottawa'; and the Spanish 'Montana', 'monte', 'Monterey', 'mulada', 'mustang', 'obispo' (pine), 'ojo', 'olla'.

Adoptions being comparatively rare, new compounds appear, and in this field invention is lively. The list of words to which an American origin is attributed is large. The tendency to make verbs of nouns is manifest—to missionary, to mitten, to monkey, to muff, to nigger, to noon, to occasion. Lines of development are sufficiently indicated by such words as 'mortician', 'osteopath', the facetious 'obfusticate', and the colloquial 'mossback'. 'Mountain', in its special combinations with -feud, -boy, -schooner, and 'Mourning', in combination with -bench, -cradle, and -piece, are suggestive of some aspects of pioneer history. We ought to be grateful for 'Offish' and the universal 'O.K.' of mysterious origin, the admirable article on which can now be supplemented by a suggestion in *American Speech* that the term came from the academic habit of writing the letters (for 'óla kalá') on approved work.

Difference in the lines of semantic development will not fail to capture the interest of the English reader. Divergence in meaning appears in such words as:

minor: a secondary subject of study.

minstrelsy: the 'Kentucky' variety.

mission: specially referring to missionary activities among the Indians, and used attributively.

mistress: a woman owner of slaves (hist.).

moderator: in Texas and elsewhere an illegal and often criminal group.

monitor: in its senses of (a) ironclad, (b) armoured truck, (c) raised roof.

monument: (a) a bound mark in surveying, (b) a milepost.

moon: a large round biscuit.

mourner: one publicly repenting sins at a revival meeting.

move: to go into new territory, to migrate.

movement: the activity of a commodity or stock in the market.

mover: (a) an emigrant to the West, (b) a *re-mover*, (c) a tenant farmer who, exhausting the natural richness of the land, moves on to repeat the process.

muck: obsolescent as barnyard manure; vegetable matter used as a fertilizer.

muff: in baseball or football, failure to handle the ball properly.

museum: showplace for curious objects and freaks.

music: liveliness, fun.

musical: having a sense of humour; funny, amusing, strange.

mutual: designating insurance companies or other organized societies whose members assist each other.

narrow-gauge: small-minded, provincial.

nasty: not a polite word in the U.S.A. Foul, dirty, offensive to touch or smell; disgusting.

nation: special reference to tribes of American Indians or the territory occupied by them.

naval officer: a Treasury official estimating customs duties.

navigate: to move or walk.

new: recently settled or available for settlement by white people.

nigger: in its various connotations of servant; a quality characteristic of negroes; a term of opprobrium; a steam-engine; a fault in insulating; a steam-plunger used in a sawmill.

northern: living in or coming from the Northern colonies or states.

notion: a small article of trade; various wares making up a cargo.

notional: full of whims, fastidious.

nutmeg: an inhabitant of the state of Connecticut.

observatory: a building in a prison yard from which watch can be kept on the prisoners.

occasion: to go about asking for work.

open: (of an office or shop) hiring both union and non-union workers without discrimination.

operate: to follow a career of crime; to engage in political machinations.

The colloquial developments of Off, On, and Onto should also be noted, together with the use of 'of' for the unstressed form of 'have' in colloquial American speech.

Another aspect of this Dictionary which must be stressed is its encyclopedic nature. Many of the articles provide excellent sidelights on American history. Noteworthy in this respect are the comprehensive ones on 'Mother Country', 'Monroe Doctrine', 'Mormon' and its attributes, 'Negro', 'Nigger', 'Non-importation', and 'Nullification'.

American slang, so ephemeral and so picturesque, finds little place here. But what exactly is the criterion of exclusion, and what delicate line is drawn between colloquial speech and slang? 'Mose', a b'hoy; 'to mosey', to move along slowly; 'to give', to get the mitten; the horrible words 'mixologist', and 'motorneer'; 'mudhook', to pull mud, to turn up missing; 'shot in the neck', to get it in the neck; 'nasty', first-class, excellent; 'nuf sed', are all considered worthy of inclusion. 'Oiled', inebriated, occurs as early as 1737.

The survival in American speech of obsolete or dialectal English words is evidenced here. Such words as 'misimprove', 'nig' (for renig), with the dialectal 'miss' (for mistress), 'muss' and 'obligate', 'nation' (adv.), the accepted spelling 'nasturtion' for 'nasturtium', 'narsaree' for 'nursery', and the note on the dialectal pronunciation of 'onion' are symptomatic of those sturdy elements which contribute to the strong, distinctive flavour of American English.

It would be interesting to know why 'mobber', and 'mobbism' are excluded from this dictionary. Again, the *O.E.D.* quotes Mrs. Stowe, *U.T.'s C.*, xiii: 'Rachel now took down a snowy *moulding-board* . . . and proceeded quietly to make up some biscuits': a board on which dough or paste is kneaded and shaped—but this is a sense which is not recorded here. Nonce words are occa-

sionally given, so that it is difficult to see why a word like 'mozo', which, according to the *O.E.D.* is Southern U.S. for male servant, groom or labourer, is not mentioned. 'Monstrous' (adj.) we are told is 'used in the specific names of unusually large fruits'. The *O.E.D.* quotes Bartlett, 1848: 'Augustus is a monstrous pretty city,' a usage recalling the Shakespearian 'monstrous little voice'. It is not clear from the citation in the *D.A.E.* when the word 'morgue' was first used in connection with newspaper obituaries. The year 1925 suggests a late date. Under 'mooning' there is a slight divergence from the *O.E.D.* which dates the quotation 1885 (*D.A.E.* 1884) and defines the condition of being moon-eyed as having eyes adapted for seeing at night.

The great work which the editors of the *D.A.E.* have undertaken is being supplemented most ably by that lively, stimulating and vigorous journal, *American Speech*.<sup>1</sup> To the student of language and of American English in particular this periodical is indispensable. Its explorations are bold and exhaustive and the range of its contributions to the study of speech is impressive. Its phonetic transcriptions from radio broadcasts are an interesting feature, and the value of articles by experts on such subjects as 'Paul Bunyan (lumberjack) talk', 'The pronunciation of Spanish Place-names in California', 'Speech currents in Egypt', 'Norwegian-American Surnames in transition', and 'Baseball Jargon' is obvious, while its recordings of new words and new evidence on Americanisms are not the least useful material which it has to offer to students and future lexicographers.

BEATRICE WHITE.

<sup>1</sup> *American Speech. A Quarterly of Linguistic Usage.* Columbia University Press (October 1942, December 1942, April 1943).

## SHORT NOTICES

**The Law of Property in Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Drama.** By PAUL S. CLARKSON and CLYDE T. WARREN. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press; London: Humphrey Milford. Pp. xxviii+345. \$3.50; 21s. 6d. net.

This book will be useful to close students of the Elizabethan idiom. The authors, as lawyers, discuss briefly and succinctly various aspects of procedure and terminology in the Elizabethan law of property, and under each heading note the references or images which occur in Elizabethan plays. The whole is summed up in two indexes of cases quoted and of dramatic citations by author and play, as well as a bibliography and general index. The information thus given will be valuable to future editors who need a handy reference or a definition of such common but to the layman often baffling terms as fine, recovery, fee simple, seisin or livery. Certain general conclusions emerge. The most important is that Shakespeare's knowledge of the law was neither profound nor remarkable, and there is thus no evidence to suggest that he was employed in a lawyer's office. The scope of the work is intentionally limited to the law of property; it would probably have led the authors too far afield to have considered such matters as the close personal relationship between players and the young gentlemen of the Inns of Court, or to have included such entertainments as the famous Gray's Inn Revels minutely described in *Gesta Grayorum*. It is to be hoped that a companion volume—Criminal Law in Elizabethan drama—will one day follow; of that aspect of the law most Elizabethan dramatists had greater first-hand experience.

G. B. HARRISON.

**Life in Eighteenth-Century England. Museum Extension Publication. Illustrative Set, Number Four.** Boston: Museum of Fine Arts. Portfolio of 42 plates. 12 in.  $\times$  16½ in. with 40-pages interpretative booklet. By ROBERT J. ALLEN. Subscription price \$4 each net; single copies \$5.

The first of the publications in this series was reviewed by the late Dr. McKerrow (*R.E.S.*, Vol. XVI, 1940, p. 87), who then explained their purpose and scope. These reproductions in collotype are designed primarily to supplement the teaching in schools by presenting 'in a concise and graphic form a survey of cultural history as reflected in the visual record of works of art and in available historic and literary evidence'. The present collection illustrates life in Eighteenth-century England from many angles. Almost inevitably, upper-class life is more fully and satisfactorily represented, for pictorial records are more abundant; but on the whole a nice balance has been struck between the upper, middle, and lower classes. Some of the paintings reproduced by such artists as Peter Monamy, Samuel Scott, John Zoffany, Benjamin Wilson, and George Morland will be unfamiliar to most English students; many of them are in public or private collections in America. Particularly striking are a view of Newmarket by John Wotton, from the Frick Art Reference Library, and Jonathan Richardson's portrait of Pope, from the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. The standard of reproduction is almost uniformly excellent.

Mr. Robert J. Allen's commentary (with a short prefatory note by Professor Chauncey B. Tinker) is attractively written, and contains a remarkable amount of information without ever appearing to be stuffed with facts. Once or twice the need for compression has left some point inadequately explained, as when (p. 22) he notes how old-fashioned gentlemen at the beginning of the century used to criticize the new mode of country houses as inhospitable. No explanation is offered, but presumably the reason was the disappearance of the old great hall, where the lord or gentleman dined among his people and kept 'open house' for passing strangers. The section on the Theatre is perhaps the least satisfactory. It opens unpromisingly: 'Throughout the eighteenth century the theatre was essentially a place of entertainment. There were very few experimental theatres and hardly anyone except the critics talked about the drama as an art or about educating the public to better things'. The trouble with eighteenth-century drama, one would have thought, was that in the hands of Addison, Steele, Lillo, Cumberland, Kelly, and the like, it was insufficiently a place of entertainment, and that popular taste did not have nearly enough say in its development. As for the critics, it is usually left to them in every age to talk about the drama as an art, and in the eighteenth century they certainly took advantage of their opportunities. And what are those 'very few' experimental theatres? Who ran them? and where and when? Mr. Allen later writes about the steadily increasing size of eighteenth-century theatres, and attributes to this growth a decline in the subtlety of acting—'extravagant gesture rather than subtle inflections of voice and changes in facial expression'. This may be what one would expect to happen, but it is not what did happen. More than one contemporary observer—Richard Cumberland, for instance—contrasted the intimate and subtle acting of Garrick with that of the stiff and vociferous Quin, a typical actor of the old school. In his discussion of painting (p. 25) Mr. Allen writes of the search for 'universality of subject, exaltation of manner, and technical skill in expression. On such qualities as these is based much of the praise heaped by Reynolds, in his *Discourses* . . . on the Italian painters, Titian, Tintoretto, and Guido'. Such a statement does not show much familiarity with the *Discourses*, where the three artists named get only grudging and partial recognition from the lecturer (whatever in his own studio he may have felt about them), and almost all his praise is reserved for Michael Angelo, Raphael, and—surprisingly to us—Caracci.

There are, therefore, some points on which one might disagree with Mr. Allen, but one's impression is that on the whole he is well-informed on almost every aspect of eighteenth-century life and thought. He does not look at the period through a haze of sentiment, nor does he harp on its picturesqueness. His one concession to the picturesque is to print his extracts from eighteenth-century books with the long 's'; since he does not reproduce the capital letters he might have spared us those other spots of contemporary colour. His own attitude to the century is sympathetic, but at the same time sufficiently detached. Writing of the frequent disturbances on the first night of plays, he remarks that 'a manager did not have to wait for the morning papers to recognize a failure'. Writing of the Pump Room at Bath, he suggests: 'Since little enough water of any sort was drunk in the eighteenth century, the drafts swallowed at the popular spas were genuinely beneficial'. With such sensible observations he conducts us through the period, and shows us the sights, taking the good and the bad as they come, enjoying the good, and extracting some quiet amusement from the bad.

JAMES R. SUTHERLAND.

**Of Magnanimity and Charity.** THOMAS TRAHERNE: Edited with an Introduction by JOHN ROTHWELL SLATER. New York: King's Crown Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1942. Pp. xvi+20+1 leaf. 6s. 6d. net.

Traherne's *Christian Ethics: or, Divine Morality opening the way to Blessedness* (1675) is an exceedingly rare book, and as it runs to over six hundred octavo pages, Mr. Slater had to abandon any idea of reprinting it in full and had to be content to select two chapters, one on 'Magnanimity' and the other on 'Charity to our Neighbour'. He has not been able to give us more than an extract from Traherne's 'Address to the Reader'. In this address Traherne explains that he does not treat of virtues in the ordinary way: 'that the Author of *The Whole Duty of Man* hath excellently done, nor as they are Prudential Expedients and Means of a Mans Place and Honour on Earth', which, he says, has, in some measure, been done by Charron.

To write a guide to felicity—Traherne's favourite theme—was his purpose, and not to give commonplace advice on conduct or urge an ascetic life. Mr. Slater has printed the two chapters unabridged, so that the reader may have 'a fair chance to see Traherne's prose at his best and at his worst'. This was wise because Traherne by no means constantly wrote on the level of the famous passage about the 'orient and immortal wheat' in the *Centuries of Meditation*. Mr. Slater has aimed at making his text 'as nearly as possible an exact facsimile' of the original. So far as I have checked them he has succeeded in doing this, though he prints a semi-colon after the word 'Universe' (p. 12, l. 18) instead of a comma, which occurs here, at any rate in the copy of *Christian Ethics* in the University Library, Cambridge.

A sentence from 'Of Charity' will illustrate Traherne's outlook and also his style when he is being neither very ecstatic nor tedious as he could be. 'Adam was commanded to love Eve, by a Silent Law, surprized by her Beauty and captivated by the Chains of Nature. He was amazed at so fair a Creature, her Presence was so Delightful that there was no need of a Law; an injunction had imported some sluggishness in the Zeal of his Affection. His Appetite and Reason were united together, and both invited him to lose himself in her Embraces. She was as acceptable a Present of the Love of GOD, as Wisdom and Goodness could invent for him.'

*Christian Ethics* is worth a fuller study than it has received. Mr. Slater suggests that libraries may prefer microfilms to reprints. It will be a pity if English literature has to be read extensively with the aid of optical apparatus other than spectacles.

HUGH MACDONALD.

**Selected Poems. Rainer Maria Rilke.** Translated by Ruth Speirs. Cairo: The Anglo-Egyptian Bookshop. Pp. viii+98. No date. No price.

This little book may be recommended as an admirably chosen and representative selection from Rilke's poetry, which will be most useful to those who know only a little German and require some help in order to read the originals for themselves, but from which those who have no German will only occasionally derive an adequate impression of Rilke's poetic power. The translator declares that in the rhymed poems, that is to say, in the great majority, she has tried to preserve the original metres, but has not attempted rhyme, since it leads to perversions of meaning, and since 'Rilke's abundance of meaning does not depend' on it. This raises very wide questions about the nature of poetry in general, which cannot be discussed here: the reviewer must content himself with declaring that Rilke's 'meaning' is, as Bradley said of Shakespeare's, a resonant meaning, or a meaning resonance, and that, in his opinion, no translation of a rhymed poem can produce anything like the original effect without rhyme. Rhythm, too, has been only fragmentarily preserved, both in the rhymed poems and in four where it would not, surely, have been insuperably difficult to preserve the form and movement of the original blank verse, *Orpheus*; *Eurydice*; *Hermes*, *Alceste*, *The Birth of Venus*, and the *Fourth Elegy*. The translator's virtues are perhaps rather negative than positive: she avoids poeticisms and is seldom grammatically inaccurate, but, on the other hand, she is too often contented with mere dictionary equivalents, which convert poetry into prose. Many of her versions are no better and no worse than what might be expected from any able student in a German Honours Course.

J. B. LEISHMAN.

## SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

BY ALICE WALKER AND GLADYS D. WILLCOCK

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, Vol. 28, No. 1, March 1944—

Poetry and Truth: an aspect of Browning's *The Ring and the Book* (H. B. Charlton), pp. 43-57.

DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL, Vol. 36, No. 3, June 1944—

Three Old English elegies (C. Collier Abbott), pp. 76-9.

Translations of *Wanderer*, *Ruin* and *Deserted Woman's Lament*; attempt to suggest 'the cadence and stressed alternative metre of the originals'.

E.L.H., Vol. 11, No. 1, March 1944—

The Romantic Movement: a selective and critical bibliography for the year 1943 (Walter Graham), pp. 1-37.

The influence of Ben Jonson's *Catiline* upon John Oldham's *Satyr upon the Jesuits* (Weldon M. Williams), pp. 38-62.

Garrick and the private theatres, with a list of amateur performances in the eighteenth century (T. H. Vail Motter), pp. 63-75.

Two new letters of Herman Melville (Harrison Hayford), pp. 76-83.

Two letters written to R. H. Dana, Jr., October 6, 1849 and May 1, 1850.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. 59, No. 1, January 1944—

Spencer's 'stony Aubrian' (Roland M. Smith), pp. 1-5.

A hitherto unidentified river in the *Faerie Queene* (IV. xi. 41).

Notes on the Plimpton MS. of the *Court of Sapience* (C. F. Bühler), pp. 5-9.

Two Old English textual errors (Howard Meroney), pp. 40-2.

*Astigendlice* in Aelfric's *Grammar*, ed. Zupitza, p. 241, ll. 9-15; and *hwæ mæg þis geheardan*, *W.S. Gospels*, Corpus MS., Matthew xix. 25.

English 'sheer (off)' (C. H. Livingston), pp. 42-5.

Source in Latin *exerrare*.

Chaucer's Knight and the Hundred Years' War (Gardiner Stilwell and H. J. Webb), pp. 45-7.

Criticism of R. S. Loomis's view; see *Essays and Studies in honor of Carleton Brown*, 1940, pp. 136-7.

Was Robyn the Miller's youth misspent? (Robert A. Pratt), pp. 47-9.

Clichés and their sources (Edmund G. Berry), pp. 50-2.

Supplementary notes to Eric Partridge's *Dictionary of Clichés*.

Melville's friend 'Toby' (Clarence Gohdes), pp. 52-5.

The publication of Melville's *Piazza Tales* (Merton M. Sealts), pp. 56-9.

The meaning of Poe's *Eldorado* (Oral Sumner Coad), pp. 59-61.

— No. 2, February 1944—

Two Old English words (Robert J. Menner), pp. 106-12.

Anglian (*ge*) *strynd* and O.E. *gullisc*.

*On fæder feorme, Beowulf*, l. 21 (Fritz Mezger), pp. 113-14.

Stanza continuity in the *Faerie Queene* (Arnold Stein), pp. 114-18.

The author of 'The Address' in Quarles's *Shepherds Oracles* (G. S. Haight), pp. 118-20.

By Phineas Fletcher or friend; not Izaak Walton.

Hamlet, melancholy and the devil (Lawrence Babb), pp. 120-2.

## MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, No. 2, February 1944—

The source of the principal plot of the *Fair Maid of the Inn* (Baldwin Maxwell), pp. 122-7.

Cervantes' *La ilustre Fregona* not the 'source', though details may have been borrowed from it.

Materials for the study of English renaissance drama (Alfred Harbage), pp. 128-33.

Survey of eleven recent works in this field.

## — No. 3, March 1944—

The nine herbs (Howard Meroney), pp. 157-60.

On the O.E. 'Nine Herbs Charm'.

Shakespeare's dove-house (Tucker Brooke), pp. 160-1.

*Romeo and Juliet*, I. iii.

Falstaff's clothes (H. J. Webb), pp. 162-4.

Sheridan's 'little bronze Pliny' (J. R. Moore), pp. 164-5.

*School for Scandal*, V. iii.

Meredith's *The Egoist* as a play (R. B. Hudson), pp. 165-8.

Sutro's version of 1898.

A new Wordsworth letter (R. F. Metzdorf), pp. 168-70.

Letter of February 24, 1830, to John Wilson Croker.

Rime in *Paradise Lost* (J. M. Purcell), pp. 171-2.

Corrections of Diekhoff's list.

Shelley's first published review of *Mandeville* (Adaline E. Glasheen), pp. 172-3.

A note on Arnold's *Civilization in the United States* (W. D. Templeman), pp. 173-4.

'Hymselfen lik a pilgrym to desgise': *Troilus*, V. 1577 (F. P. Magoun, Jr.), pp. 176-8.

Chaucer's eight years' sickness (R. S. Loomis), pp. 178-80.

The English prose translation of *Legenda Aurea* (Sister Mary Jeremy, O.P.), pp. 181-3.

Revival of Bokenham's claim to authorship of the MS. version used by Caxton.

## — No. 4, April 1944—

Smollett and the elder Pitt (Lewis M. Knapp), pp. 250-7.

A note on Robert Henryson's allusions to religion and law (M. W. Stearns), pp. 257-64.

Robert Henryson and the leper Cresseid (M. W. Stearns), pp. 265-9.

Canon Yeoman's Prologue, G. 563-6: horse or man (George R. Coffman), pp. 269-71.

Another analogue for the violation of the maiden in the *Wife of Bath's Tale* (George R. Coffman), pp. 271-4.

Variant readings in three of Shelley's poems (Elizabeth Nitchie), pp. 274-7.

Notes on three poems the discovery of which was announced in *T.L.S.*, August 29, 1939.

A grant to *Hudibras* Butler (Norma E. Bentley), p. 281.

Grant of £20 from 'secret service money', May 10, 1680.

Samuel Johnson 'making æther' (John J. Brown), p. 286.

## MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. 39, No. 2, April 1944—

Milton and liberty (H. J. C. Grierson), pp. 97-115.

The use made of Owen Felltham's *Resolves*: a study in plagiarism (Jean Robertson), pp. 108-15.

Heathcliff's country (M. Hope Dodds), pp. 116-29.

On Emily Brontë's imaginary kingdom of 'Gondal'.

NATIONAL REVIEW, June 1944—

Pope and Gulliver. With a new poem by his hand (Norman Ault), pp. 510-16.

NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER, May 1944—

Pope and his dogs. With a new poem by his hand (Norman Ault), pp. 212-21.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CHRONICLE, Vol. 5, No. 1, November 1943—

Some Coleridge notes on Richter and Reimarus (R. Florence Brinkley), pp. 1-13.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. 59, No. 1, March 1944—

Le Boèce de Chaucer et les manuscrits français de la *Consolatio* de J. de Meun (V. L. Dedek-Héry), pp. 18-25.

Theories of monarchy in *Mum and the Sothsegger* (Ruth Mohl), pp. 26-44.

Hamlet's sea-voyage (W. W. Lawrence), pp. 45-70.

Tyson's *Orang-outang, sive homo silvestris* and Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (M. F. Ashley Montagu), pp. 84-9.

Keats, Robertson, and *That most hateful land* (Harold E. Briggs), pp. 184-99.

Evidence identifying 'that most hateful land' in second ode to Fanny Brawne, with N. America as described in W. Robertson's *History of America*.

Fanny Keats: biographical notes (Hyder E. Rollins), pp. 200-11.

TEXAS UNIVERSITY STUDIES IN ENGLISH, 1943—

The 'pre-conceived pattern' of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (Robert Adger Law), pp. 5-14.

Drayton's herbals (Thomas P. Harrison, Jr.), pp. 15-25.

Relation of Drayton's flower and herb catalogues to Gerard and other herbalists.

The imagery of Francis Quarles's *Emblems* (Eleanor James), pp. 26-49.

John Milton and renaissance dictionaries (D. T. Stearns and Ernest William Talbert), pp. 50-65.

Coleridge's *Lewti*: the biography of a poem (G. Louis Joughin), pp. 66-93.

The unfinished diary of Disraeli's journey to Flanders and the Rhineland, 1824 (C. L. Cline), pp. 94-114.

The critical reception of Milton's *De Doctrina Christiana* (Francis E. Mineka), pp. 115-47.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, March 18, 1944—

Killigrew's *Claracilla* (F. S. Boas), p. 144.

Notice of a manuscript of this play in the Castle Howard Library.

Juvenile drama (a Correspondent), p. 144.

— March 25—

Charlotte Yonge and Mary Coleridge (Jessie E. Chitty), p. 151.

Replies from F. Algar and Georgina Battiscombe, April 8, p. 175; postscript from Jessie E. Chitty, April 22, p. 199.

The text of *Phineas Finn* (R. W. Chapman), p. 156.

Reply from Simon Nowell-Smith, April 15, p. 192.

## TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, April 1—

Medora Leigh's daughter (Duncan Gray), p. 163.

Andrew Lang's works (W. M. Parker), p. 168.

Addendum to the *C.B.E.L.* bibliography.

## April 15—

Michael Wood, Marian printer (J. F. Mozley), p. 187.

Addendum, April 22, p. 199.

Sheridan's *Robinson Crusoe* (George H. Nettleton), p. 192.

Miss Braddon (Montague Summers), p. 192.

'Most busie lest . . .' (Willson Disher), p. 192.

## April 22—

A Southey manuscript (Bertram R. Davis), p. 199.

Enquiry about the Castle Howard MS. of Southey's supposed 'voyage to Brazil and the River Plate, 1808-09' (see *T.L.S.*, March 11, p. 132). Reply (anon.), May 27, p. 259.

## April 29—

The pronoun 'its' (C. L. Quinton), p. 211.

## May 6—

Playbills of the Crummleses (Willson Disher), p. 228.

Further note, May 27, p. 259

## May 13—

William Beckford (C. F. Bell), p. 235.

Reply (anon.), May 20, p. 247.

Robin Hood (L. V. D. Owen), p. 236.

## May 20—

A Poe story (James R. Canny), p. 252.

On 'The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym of Nantucket'.

Gissing's academic career (anon.), p. 252.

## May 27—

Thomas Mitchell and Thomas Barnes (W. M. Parker), p. 259.

Mrs. Oliphant (Lucy Poate Stebbins), p. 259.

Request for biographical material.

*He, She and It* (Roger Lancelyn Green), p. 264.

On some parodies of Rider Haggard's tale. Reply from W. Reeve Wallace, June 17, p. 300; from Roger Lancelyn Green, July 1, p. 324.

## June 3—

Mr. Pope's 'Poetical Soop' (Norman Ault), p. 276.

## June 10—

Busts of Pope and the Stanhopes (K. A. Esdaile), p. 283.

Reply from Willard Connely, June 24, p. 307.

## June 17—

Sir A. Quiller-Couch (F. Brittain), p. 295.

Request for biographical material.

## June 24—

Gerard Manley Hopkins (Gerard Hopkins), p. 309.

On the month of his birth.

Smollett's letter to Phillip Miller (Lewis M. Knapp), p. 312.

A letter dated January 20, 1759.

d  
,